भगवद्रामानुजकृतः

VEDĀNTASĀRA
OF
BHAGAVAD RĀMĀNUJA

EDITED BY
PANDIT V. KRISHNAMACHARYA
WITH
English Translation by
SRI M. B. NARASIMHA AYYANGAR, M.SC.

THE ADYAR LIBRARY
1953

Price RS. 20. 00

Printed by D V Syamala Rau, at the Vasanta Press,
The Theosophical Society, Adyar, Madras 20

PREFACE

THE *Vedāntasāra* is an easy and concise commentary on the Brahmasūtras of Bādarāyana who is believed to be identical with Vyāsa, the famous author of the Mahābhārata. The *Vedāntasāra* was written by *Bhagavad Rāmānuja* (1017 to 1137 A.D.) in accordance with the views of the Vis'iṣṭādvaita school of Vedānta. *S'rī Rāmānuja* was born at S'rīperumbudur near Kāñcīpuram as the son of Kes'avasomayājin and Bhūdevī. He was the pupil of Mahāpūrṇa and younger contemporary of S'rī Yāmunācārya of S'rīrangam. His other works are: S'rībhāṣya, Bhagavadgītābhāṣya, Vedārthasamgraha, Vedāntadīpa, Gadyatraya and Nityagrantha. Regarding the complete biography of *S'rī Rāmānuja*, the attention of the readers is drawn to the Rāmānujacampū of Rāmānujācārya, published in the Madras Govt. Oriental MS. Series No. 6. His doctrine and teaching have been fully dealt with by Prof. P. N. Srinivasacarya in his book entitled 'The Philosophy of Vis'iṣṭādvaita' published in the Adyar Library Series No. 39. This system was first expounded by S'rī Nāthamuni, was developed to a great extent by S'rī Yāmunācārya through his works and was well preserved by S'rī Rāmānuja through his works like the

S'rībhāṣya, and Vedārthasaṁgraha, after refuting the contrary views of the opponents.

Perhaps this edition of the *Vedāntasāra* with English translation is unique in its kind and I believe it will render great and valuable service to the research scholars in their comparative and critical study of the Vedānta philosophy.

The under mentioned MSS. and printed book have been used for this edition:

1. A 1. The palm-leaf MS. of the Adyar Libray. Grantha script Injured. Complete. No. 20. H. 38.
2. A 2. The palm-leaf MS. of the Adyar Library. Grantha script. Injured. Incomplete. No. 24. L. 3
3. M 1. The palm-leaf MS. of the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library. Telugu script. Slightly injured. Complete. D. No. 5022.
4. M 2 The palm-leaf MS. of the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library. Grantha script. Injured. Complete D. No 5023.
5. M 3. The palm-leaf MS. of the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library. Telugu script Slightly injured. Complete. D. No. 5024.
6. Pr. The printed edition of the Sri Venkatesvara and Company, Madras.

The translation was written by my friend S'rī M. B. Narasiṁha Ayyangar of Bangalore. I am glad that I had the opportunity to revise and edit it with the Sanskrit text in the Adyar Library Series No. 83. I am indebted to the translator and to the Director of the Adyar Library for the inclusion of this publication in the Adyar Library Series.

Thanks are due to the Curator, Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, Madras for lending the MSS. Nos. 3 to 5 mentioned above, for collation.

My Colleague Pandit K. Ramachandra Sarma rendered valuable assistance in reading the proofs and preparing the indexes. I thankfully acknowledge his help.

The Vasanta Press, Adyar, has to be thanked for bringing out the volume with attractive neatness and promptness.

9-2-1953 V. KRISHNAMACHARYA

INTRODUCTION

AFTER completing the course of study of the *Vedas*, the student should perform the rituals mentioned therein. There are rules prescribed for the proper performance of them. But in the *Vedas* proper, these rules are not mentioned at all Therefore the student has to go to other works for them. Consequently certain subsidiary works on the rules of interpretation were composed by the sages and the earliest of these works was the *Mīmāṁsāsūtras of Jaimini.*

But these *Sūtras* were very short statements and they could be interpreted in different ways; consequently a number of commentators arose. They interpreted these *Sūtras* differently. The performance of the rituals mentioned therein grant only limited and transitory results. Hence these vedic scholars went in search of other systems that could give the unlimited and everlasting results.

Bādarāyaṇa is the author of the *Brahmasūtras.* He has stated therein, on the authority of the *Upaniṣads*, that the knowledge of the *Brahman* leads to everlasting benefits. *Bādarāyaṇa* mentions the names of *Āśmarathya*, *Auḍulomi*, *Bādari* and *Kāśakṛtsna* to show that they also were the writers on the subject before him.

Certain occidental writers have placed the *Sūtra* period in the second century B. C. Their one object seems to have been to show to the world that the Indians copied everything

from the Greek literature. But the Indian writers have not mentioned the date of their composition in any of their works. Hence it is not possible to determine exactly when these *Sūtras* were composed. But the general impression is that *Bādarāyaṇa*, who is no other than *Vyāsa*, lived about 3101 B. C. *i e.* the beginning of the Kali age.

These *Sūtras*, as already stated, are short and cryptic statements. They can be interpreted in any way as the commentators liked. Hence they had a number of commentators, *namely*, *S'rī S'aṁkara*, *Rāmānuja*, *Pūrṇaprjña*, *Bhāskara*, *Nimbārka*, *Vallabha* and others. Each of these commentators interpreted the *Sūtras* in his own way different from the others. At times, a *Sūtra* was split into two by certain commentators or some of the *Sūtras* are missing in certain commentaries.

S'rī Rāmānuja has contributed nine works in Sanskrit on the *Vis'istādvaita* philosophy. None of his Tamil works is available so far. The Sanskrit works are (1) *Vedāntasāra*, (2) *Vedāntadīpa*, (3) *S'rī-Bhāṣya* (4) *Gītābhāsya*, (5) *Vedārthasaṁgraha*, (6) *S'araṇāgatigadya*, (7) *Vaikuṇthagadya*, (8) *S'rī-ranggagadya* and (9) *Nityagrantha*. Of these, the *S'rī-Bhāṣya* is an elaborate commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* of *Bādarāyaṇa*. *Vedāntasāra* is a very concise commentary on the same and *Vedāntadīpa* is a commentary in between these two.

In the introduction to his *Vedāntadīpa S'rī Rāmānuja* summarises the teachings of *Vedānta* to the following effect: Of the three ultimate entities known to philosophy, the intelligent individual soul is essentially different from the non-intelligent matter and the Supreme *Brahman*. The essential differences thus existing between matter, soul and the *Brahman*, are intrinsic and natural. God, who is the same

as the Supreme *Brahman*, is the material and efficient cause of the universe; and the universe, which is made up of matter and soul, is the effect produced by Him. Matter and soul form the body of God, and this body is capable of existing in a subtle, as well as in a gross condition. God with his subtle body constitutes the universe in His casual condition; and with His gross body, He forms the created universe itself. The individual souls enter into matter and thereby make it live. Similarly God enters into matter and soul and give them their powers and their specific characters. The universe without God is exactly analogous to matter without soul and in the world, as we know it, all things are what they are, because God has penetrated into them and rules and guides them all from within, so much so that all things are representatives of Him and all words denote Him in the main.

S'rī Rāmānuja has based his commentaries on the following works: (1) *Divyaprabandha of S'rī S'aṭhakoṭa*; (2) *Siddhitraya* (3) *Āgamaprāmānya* and (4) *Stotraratna of S'rī Yāmuna*; and (5) *Nyāyatattva* and (6) *Yogarahasya of S'rī Nāthamuni*. Of these the *Divyaprabandka* is written in Tamil and the rest are all written in Sanskrit. Further *S'rī Nāthmuni's* works are not available now.

Certain special features can be noted in *S'rī Rāmānuja's* works. Of all the Sanskrit commentators of the *Brahmasūtra*, *Rāmānuja* is unique in one respect and that is this *namely* he proved the relation between the *Brahman* on one side and the souls and matter on the other, in the form of soul and body (*S'arīra-s'arīribhāva*) so that all the scriptural texts on the *Bheda* and *Abheda* between them, could be sensibly interpreted. In support of this view he mentions *Bodhāyana*, *Dramiḍa*, *Guha*, and *Ṭanka* and others, who had lived before

him and who had written treatises on the *Brahmasūtras.* He also states in *S'rī-Bhāsya* that he has followed their teachings in this work.

S'rī Rāmānuja has held that the twelve chapters of *Pūrva-mīmāṁsa,* four chapters of *Saṁkarṣakāṇḍa* and the four chapters of the *Brahmasūtras* constitute one system of philosophy. In support of this view, he has quoted the passage from *Bodhāyana* thus: "संहितमेतच्छारीरकं जैमिनीयेन षोडशलक्षणेनेति शास्त्रैकत्वसिद्धिः". The authors of these three works are different persons, but these constitute one main work, as they deal with one subject. Jaimini begins his work with *Atha* (then). The *Brahmasūtras* also begin with *Atha.* By this, it is not correct to hold that they are different works. Even in *Jaimini's Mīmāmsāsūtras* different chapters begin with the word *Atha.*

According to *S'rī Rāmānuja, Bhaktiyoga* is the means for the realisation of the Self and the attainment of Mokṣa which constitutes eternal Bliss. It is synonymous with *Upāsana* (meditation). That *Bkakti* (devotion) results wholly from *Viveka* (discrimination), *Vimoka* (freedom), *Abhyāsa* (practice), *Kriyā* (work), *Kalyāṇa* (auspiciousness), *Anavasāda* (absence of weakness), and *Anuddharṣa* (absence of excessive merriment); because it is only so possible, and because also there is scriptural authority to that effect.

Who then is this *Brahman*? *S'rī Rāmānuja* defines Him thus: 'By the word *Brahman* is denoted the Highest Person who is, by nature, devoid of all evils and is possessed of a host of auspicious qualities, which are innumerable and unsurpassable in excellence. For, everywhere in the contexts the word *Brahman* is seen to have been derived from the association of *Bṛhattva* (greatness) and whatever greatness is, by nature as well as by qualities, unsurpassable in excellence, that is its

primary and natural meaning. And He who possesses such greatness, is alone the Lord of all. Hence the word *Brahman* is primarily used to signify Him alone. In cases where, on account of the association of a modicum of that quality, other things than the Lord are meant by the word *Brahman*, it must have been used in a secondary sense; because it is improper to postulate a variety of meanings for it, as it is improper in the case also of the word, *Bhagavat*. He is the Supreme Self known as *Nārāyaṇa* whose abode is *S'rī Vaikuṇṭha* and whose consort is *S'rī* or *Mahā-Lakṣmī*.

The *Brahmasūtras* consist of four *Adhyāyas* (chapters) and each of the four chapters consists of four *Pādas* (parts). The first chapter is called the *Samanvayādhyāya* and it determines that the *Brahman* is the cause of creation, sustenance and destruction of the universe. The second chapter is called the *Avirodhādhyāya* and it removes any inconsistency that may arise for such determination. It establishes firmly what the first chapter has done. The third chapter is called *Sādhanādhyāya* and it mentions the means for attaining the *Brahman*. The last chapter is called *Phalādhyāya* and it treats of the results obtained from that means. In the scheme of things, the first two chapters are quite distinct from the last two chapters.

The *Vedāntasūtra* begins with this benedictory verse:

'I bow unto *Viṣṇu* who has for his body all the sentient and the nonsentient beings, who is the Self of all objects, who is associated with the Goddess *S'rī*; who is the Ocean of Bliss untainted with impurity'.

By this we learn that the Supreme Being according to *S'rī Rāmānuja* is *Viṣṇu* who has for his body all the sentient and the non-sentient beings. It is also clear that the sentient beings, the non-sentient things and the Lord are distinct from

each other and that the Lord is possessed of a host of auspicious qualities bereft of all evils. The Lord could only be approached through *Bhakti* (devotion) or *Prapatti* which is only a form of *Bhakti* (devotion).

I Adhyāya. The four *Sūtras* establish in a short compass the system of philosophy and religion as enunciated by *Rāmānuja*, thus:

That the *Vedāntas* establish the *Brahman*, who is blameless and possessed of good qualities, who is the cause of the universe and who has the nature of unsurpassed bliss. The *Brahman* then is the object of highest pursuit and He is both the instrumental and material cause of the universe.

The *Sūtras* 5 to 12 refute the theory of *Sāmkhya* that the *Pradhāna* or *Prakṛti* causes the world.

The *Sūtras* 13 to 22 advance another argument, namely: the Self mentioned for meditation in the text, 'Different from this which consists of knowledge, is the still Inner Self, the *Ānandamaya*' (*Tait.* II-I-1) etc., can only be the Highest Self and not the individual self.

The next two *Sūtras* determine that the Supreme Being is denoted by the word *Ākāśa* and *Prāṇa*; because there are the scriptural texts—"All these beings are, indeed, born out of *Ākāśa*" (*Chānd.* Up. I-9 11) etc.

The *Sūtras* 25 to 28 raise another point, *namely*: The word *Jyotis* (or light) occurring in the scriptural text, 'Now that Light, which shines beyond this Highest Heaven, etc. (*Chānd.* III-13-7) cannot be the digestive heat in the stomach, because in the same context, there occurs a reference to the Highest Person who is denoted by the word, *Jyotis* (light). Further there is nothing wrong if *Jyotis* is taken as the digestive heat; because the teaching here is a commendation enjoining the continued meditation of that Highest Person

in the form of that digestive heat for the purpose of attaining the fruition of a desired result.

The last four *Sūtras* 29 to 32 state that the word Indra, used to denote Indra as identified with *Prāṇa*, refers to the Highest Person, whose body is Indra.

The remaining parts 2 to 4 also deal with certain scriptural texts and clearly state that the Universal cause is the Highest Self and not the individual selves. (Vide *S'rī Vedāntades'ika's Adhikaraṇasārāvalī*, verse 18 "तत्राद्येऽत्यन्तगूढाविशदविशदसुस्पष्टजीवादिवाचः".

II Adhyāya. The first two *Sūtras* of the first part of the second chapter deal with the topic: *Kapila* is a great sage, who composed the *Sāmkhyasūtras* and he states that *Pradhāna* is the cause of creation etc., of the universe. As such his system has to be accepted. If an argument of this type could be accepted it will lead to the result, *namely*, *Manusmṛti* and other works will have no place and have to be discarded as useless. The *Vedānta* texts are in need of supplementary texts to establish their meaning. The other *Smṛti* writers have contradicted the meaning of the *Vedānta* texts. It is only *Manu* and others that have supported their meaning. Hence *Manu* and others and not *Kapila*, that have to be accepted as the authors of the supplementary texts.

The next *Sūtra* determines this point, *namely*: The *Yogasūtras* were composed by a great person like *Hiraṇyagarbha*. Hence it has to be accepted as a supplementary text. Here the argumentators have missed one important point. *Hiraṇyagarbha* is after all the four-faced *Brahman*, who is tainted with the qualities of *Rajas* and *Tamas*, and he has composed these *Sūtras*. Therefore it has to be assumed that these *Yogasūtras* are contaminated with the qualities of *Rajas* and *Tamas*. Hence they have to be rejected.

The next nine *Sūtras* raise an important point: The universe is a non-sentient being and the *Brahman* is a sentient being. A sentient being cannot be the material cause of a non-sentient being. This is so seen in the world. Hence *Brahman* could not be the cause of the universe. This is not correct. We find in the world that the sentient beings etc. are born out of the non-sentient ones. Therefore it is also appropriate to state that the *Brahman* is the cause of the world.

The next *Sūtra* states thus: *Kaṇāda, Akṣapāda* and the *Buddha* have accepted the atoms to be the cause of the world. Therefore their theory has to be accepted. This is not correct; because they have established their system on reasoning discarding the scriptural texts.

The next *Sūtra* states thus: The *Brahman* has for his body all the sentient and the non-sentient beings. Therefore he has to experience all pleasure and pain like any other individual self. This is not correct; because the pleasure and pain are subject to *Karman* and the *Brahman* is free from all *Karmans.*

The next six *Sūtras* state thus: The world which is effected by the *Brahman* is not different from the *Brahman,* because the effects such as pot etc. are perceived to be not different from their causes, the clod of clay etc.

The next three *Sūtras* raise an important point. Suppose the universe becomes identically one with the *Brahman.* Then the *Brahman* becomes tainted with the mistake, *namely,* that He is the creator of the universe that is not beneficial to Himself. This is not so; He is distinct from the universe in His essential nature as stated in the scriptural text, 'Remaining within the self' etc. Hence the faults of the world do not touch Him.

The first nine *Sūtras* of the second part of the second chapter state thus: 'The *Pradhāna* of the *Sāmkhyas* cannot produce the universe; because the *Pradhāna*, which is non-sentient cannot produce the effect without the association of the sentient agent.

Then *Bādarāyana* refutes the views of the *Sautrāntika* and *Vaibhasika* schools of *Buddhism* thus: The *Bauddhas* have accepted that the aggregates of earth etc. are nothing but the atoms. But their argument falls to the ground; because they have accepted the momentariness of all objects including the atoms that form the aggregate and are destroyed in the second moment of their existence.

The next three *Sūtras* refute the views of the *Yogācāras* thus: 'The views held by the school, that establish the negation of objects other than cognition, are not correct.' What is apprehended in the sentence, 'I know the pot' is the object that is used in the objective case. It is not possible to say that its negation is apprehended. The forms of cognition do produce in men the idea of particular objects and not the objects themselves.

The next *Sūtra* criticises the view of the *Mādhyamika* school. 'The view of universal voidness is not correct, because when the proposition is to be proved it should refer to the object of existence and not of nothingness.'

After refuting different views held by the opponents, *Bādarāyaṇa* comes to the *Pāñcarātra* school. This *Adhikaraṇa* is called as *Utpattyasaṁbhavādhikaraṇa* or the *Pāñcarātrādhikarana*. He raises the objection against this school in the first two *Sūtras* and answers it in the last two *Sūtras*. According to him the *Pāñcarātra* system is entirely correct and it does not contradict the view of *Vedānta*. *Saṁkarṣana*, *Pradyumna* and *Aniruddha* are different incarnations of Lord *Vāsudeva*,

The *Caturvyūhopāsana* is one of the *Brahmavidyās* like the *Sadvidyā*, *Daharavidyā* etc.

In the third part of the second chapter, the author determines that the spatial ether (*Ākāśa*) is a product as there are scriptural statements to prove this. Same could be said of the *Vāyu* etc.

Then he explains that the individual self is not pure consciousness as held by opponents. But he is a knower; and he is inseparably connected with another substance known as knowledge. With the help of this knowledge he is able to find out everything. This knowledge bears to the self the relationship of the rays to the object that emanates those rays.

The next seven *Sūtras* state thus: The self is the doer and not the three qualities, *viz.*, *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*; the next two *Sūtras* state thus · The actions of the individual self are all dependent upon the Highest Self. But it should not be said that the Highest Self is responsible for all man's actions, because man alone should choose the first action and the subsequent actions arise as a corollary to his first action.

The first three *Sūtras* of the fourth part of the second chapter state thus: 'The sense organs are all products in the same way as the spatial ether (*Ākāśa*) etc. because there is the scriptural statement.' The *Sat*, alone, my dear, was in the beginning!

The next two *Sūtras* state thus: 'The sense-organs are eleven in number and they move with the self.'

Then the topic of the *Prāṇa* is elaborately dealt with in this part.

III Adhyāya. The first seven *Sūtras* of the first part of the third chapter determine this point: 'The individual self when he moves from one body to another, goes enveloped by the rudiments of the elements',

The next four *Sūtras* state thus: 'On the passing of the works, the individual self returns to the world with a remainder of the works, whose fruit he has not enjoyed.

The next ten *Sūtras* state thus: Those who have done meritorious works, (*Puṇya-karmans*), reach the moon. But those who have done non-meritorious works (*Pāpa-karmans*) do not go to the moon.

The next *Sūtra* states thus: The individual self on his return journey from the moon passes through the ether, the wind, the smoke and the cloud in an order. Then he comes into the earth in the form of rain.

The first six *Sūtras* of the second part of the third chapter state thus: The objects seen in the dreams are real and not created by the individual selves: but they are the creations of the Highest Self.

The next two *Sūtras* state thus: 'In the deep state of sleep, it is stated that the individual selves sleep in the *Nāḍis* and also in pericardium. When they awake they do not know that they have slept on the *Brahman*.' The next *Sūtra* states thus: 'The same person, (who was in a deep state of sleep) rises from sleep; because there are the works for which the person of defective knowledge has to undergo retribution; because also there is the remembrance.

The next fifteen *Sūtras* state thus: 'No mistake arises in he Highest *Brahman*, even if He remains as an immanent Self in all the four states, such as the waking state etc. In the scriptures and in the *Smṛtis* it is stated that *Highest Brahman* possesses twofold characteristics, *namely*, the absence of inauspicious qualities and the presence of all auspicious ones. Sins do cling to the individual selves. The individual selves and the Highest Self are encased in a body; yet their differential characteristics are stated in the scriptures.

The third and fourth parts of the third chapter deal with various *Brahmavidyās* which lead men to *Moksa* and other aspirations according to their wishes.

IV Adhyāya. The first two *Sūtras* of the first part of the fourth chapter states thus: 'The knowing that is useful for the attainment of the final release, has to be repeated more than once.' *Bhagavān S'rī Kṛṣṇa* states thus: 'Worship Me, with a devotion, directed to nothing else. Whose minds are fixed on Me I lift them before long etc.' (*Bhag. Gī.* 12-7). The next *Sūtra* states thus: 'The meditation should be on the Highest Self who is the Self of the individual selves. The next *Sūtra* state thus: 'The Highest Self should not be apprehended in the symbol of the mind etc.

He then states thus: Meditation has to be made every-day till death, because the scriptures say so. The next *Sūtra* states thus: When the meditation on the *Brahman* is begun the earlier sins do not cling to him; because those meditations have that power. The next *Sūtra* states thus: 'As regards the wise, the ordinary good deeds obstruct the attainment of final release. But as they grant undesierd fruits, they either do nothing to the selves or become destroyed. After death they do not yield any results. The next *Sūtra* states thus: 'The good and evil deeds performed before the acquisition of knowledge, become destroyed without granting any fruits. The texts say that they last till death.

The next three *Sūtras* state: *Agnihotra* etc. are the works to be performed by the *Ās'ramin*. The life of an *Ās'ramin* is only intended for the acquisition of knowledge. The good and bad deeds do not cling to a person, who has obtained the knowledge on the *Brahman*. Further the works done with knowledge cause obstruction to the grant of the fruits after death. The last *Sūtra* states thus: 'Having

destroyed by enjoyment the two kinds of deeds, the self reaches the *Brahman*'.

The first two *Sūtras* of the second part state thus: 'The organ of speech and other sense-organs stop working at the time of death. Hence it is right to say that the sense-organs combine with the mind at death.

The next *Sūtra* states: At death the mind is combined with the breath (*Prāṇa*) and the *Prāṇa* with the self.

Then it is stated thus: The wise and the unwise follow the same path till they reach the path of light, etc. The *Brahman* could be reached only by traversing the path of light. A subtle body persists even after death.

Then the *Sūtras* state thus: The Highest Person remains within the heart of the individual selves. Through His grace the door of the heart becomes illuminated. Then he leaves the body through the *Suṣumnā Nāḍī* on his head'.

The next *Sūtra* states thus: 'The wise go upwards through the rays. These rays remain at night also. In the winter season they are covered with snow. The next *Sūtra* states thus: 'Even those, who die at night, reach the *Brahman*. The man must perform his duty, as long as he is encased in the body. The works, which have begun to produce the results, die with the body. They do not stand in the way of attainment of the *Brahman*.

The next two *Sūtras* state thus: The wise reach the *Brahman* even if they die during the southern progress of the sun. The *Yogins* remember both the paths and they will not be deluded by doubt.

The third part begins: 'The wise traverse by the path of right etc'.

The next two *Sūtras* state thus: The presiding deities of light etc. who are directed by the Highest Person are

conductors of the wise. After lightning, the self reaches the *Brahman.* The next ten *Sūtras* state thus: *Bādari* thinks that those who meditate on the effected *Brahman* (*i.e. Hiranyagarbha*) traverse the path of light etc. Because the self that reaches *Hiraṇyagarbha* does not come back to the world; because when the world of *Hiranyagarbha* passes away, then the selves go with their ruler to the Highest. *Jaimini* thinks that the Highest alone should be meditated upon always. *Bādarāyaṇa* states that those who meditate upon the *Brahman* traverse the path of light etc. Some meditate upon the *Brahman* as the Self of their selves. While others meditate on their selves as having the *Brahman* for the Self.

The first three *Sūtras* of the fourth part state thus: 'The self reveals itself in all his glory when he reaches the Highest.'

The next *Sūtra* states thus: 'The released self experiences the Highest, who is his Self, as one with him.'

The next three *Sūtras* state thus: *Jaimini* thinks that the nature like that of the *Brahman,* such as free from sin, manifests itself in the individual Self. *Audulomi* thinks that his very nature is intelligence. But *Bādarāyana* opines that he possesses both of them mentioned above.

The next two *Sūtras* state thus: 'The Highest Person, while in a sportive mood, is born as the son of *Vasudeva* and *Daśaratha* by His mere wills. In the same manner the released soul, who is included in the sportive activity of the Highest *Brahman,* can have father, etc. in the world through his will. But the released Self is not subject to *Karman* at anytime.

The next seven *Sūtras* state thus: *Bādari* holds that released Self does not possess a body and the sense-organs. *Jaimini* opines that he becomes manifold with the help of the body and sense-organs. But *Bādarāyaṇa* thinks that he possesses both these characteristics. The released Self does

not possess bodies, that are his own creation. He enjoys the sport, created by the Highest Person. The Self enjoys everything by entering all as in the case of the lamp. The Self remains in one place. But he experiences everything through knowledge that acts as his light.

The next five *Sūtras* state thus: The released self possesses the character of the Highest Person except creation, sustenance, and destruction of the world.

The last *Sūtra* states thus The released self does not come back again to the world

S'ri Rāmānuja postulates Personal God. He defines the *Brahman* thus 'By the word, *Brahman*, is denoted the Highest Person, who is, by nature, devoid of all evil, and is possessed of hosts of auspicious qualities, which are innumerable and unsurpassable in excellence. He accepts a world that is real, as is opposed to the world of illusion of the *Advaitins.* Of the means of attainment he accepts the *Bhakti* and *Prapatti* wherein the Lord is considered both as a means and the object of attainment. Only he attains the Lord whom He elects with grace. This is the truth of this system.

In concluding I wish to offer my heart felt thanks to Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Ayyangar, at whose instance I translated into English the text of the *Vedāntasāra* and to Vaidyaratna G. Srinivasa Murti Director Adyar Library for undertaking to publish this work in the Adyar Library Series. My special thanks are also due to Pandit V. Krishnamacharya of the Adyar Library for revising the translation and editing it with the text. He also has added some necessary notes and a valuable introduction in Sanskrit. I request the general public to pardon me for any short comings that they may find in the work.

4-2-1953 M. B. NARASIMHA AYYANGAR

उपोद्घातः

प्रणामं लक्ष्मणमुनिः प्रतिगृह्णातु मामकम् ।
प्रसाधयति यत्सूक्तिः स्वाधीनपतिकां श्रुतिम् ॥
लक्ष्मणमुनेः प्रसादादुद्धृतमदसीयसूक्तिदुग्धाब्धेः ।
अद्वैततत्त्वममृतं स्वदतां विज्ञानधनलोकः ॥

'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' इति श्रुतिर्मुमुक्षूणामवधेयान् परतत्त्वहित-पुरुषार्थान् संक्षेपेणाह—परतत्त्वं ब्रह्म । तद्वेदनं हितम् । तत्प्राप्तिः पुरुषार्थ इति । एवं संक्षेपेण निर्दिष्टांस्तानेव किंचिद्विस्तरेण स्वयमेवाह—"सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म । यो वेद निहितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन् । सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह । ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता" इति । निरुपाधिकसत्तायोगि नित्यासंकुचितज्ञानैकाकारं त्रिविधपरिच्छेदरहितं च ब्रह्मेति ब्रह्मस्वरूपं विवृतम् । हृदयगुहानिहितत्वप्रकारकज्ञानपदेनोपासनं हितमित्युक्तम् । अप्राकृताकाशशब्दिते परमपदे समस्तकल्याणगुणविशिष्टपरब्रह्मानुभवः परम-पुरुषार्थ इति च विवृतम् । तथाहि—"सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह । ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता" इत्यत्र परमे व्योमन्नित्यप्राकृताकाशशब्दितं परमपद-मुच्यते । अप्राकृतपरमपदाख्यस्थानविशेषप्राप्तिपूर्वकं परब्रह्मणस्तद्गुणानां च परिपूर्णानुभव एव पुरुषार्थ इत्युक्तं भवति । न च ब्रह्मणः परमपदाख्यस्थान-विशेषवर्तित्वे देशतः परिच्छिन्नत्वात् त्रिविधपरिच्छेदराहित्यप्रतिपादकेना-नन्तपदेन विरोधः शङ्क्यः । न हि वयं परमपदस्थत्ववचनात् ब्रह्मणोऽन्यत्र स्थितिं व्यासेधामः, येन देशपरिच्छेदेन विरोधः स्यात्; किं तु "यो वेद

निहितं गुहायाम्" "अन्तः प्रविष्टः शास्ता जनानां सर्वात्मा" "नित्यं विभुं सर्वगतम्" "अहमात्मा गुडाकेश सर्वभूताशयस्थितः" "यथा सर्वगतो विष्णुः" "सर्वगतत्वादनन्तस्य" इत्यादिभिः प्रमाणशतैः सर्वान्तरात्मतया सर्वगततया चोक्तस्य तस्य दिव्यमङ्गलविग्रहविशिष्टतया नित्यविभूतिमत्तया च स्थानविशेषेऽवस्थितिं ब्रूमः। "क्षयन्तमस्य रजसः पराके" "तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम्" इत्याद्याः श्रुतयो हि सर्वगस्यापि ब्रह्मणः स्थानविशेषावस्थितिं प्रतिपादयन्ति।

एवं च प्राप्तिर्नामानुभवरूपा। प्राप्यं च परं ब्रह्मेति लभ्यते। स उपासको ब्रह्मणा सह सर्वान् कामानश्नुत इत्यन्वयः। अत्र ब्रह्मणा सहेति "सहयुक्तेऽप्रधाने" इत्यनुशासनात् सहयोगे तृतीया। सा च 'पयसा सह ओदनं भुङ्क्ते' इत्यत्रेव भोग्यसाहित्यपरा। ब्रह्मणा सहितान् सर्वान् कामान् समश्नुत इत्यर्थः। न तु 'पुत्रेण सहागतः पिता' इत्यत्रेव ब्रह्मणा सहितः सन् सर्वान् कामान् अश्नुत इति भोक्तृसाहित्यपरा, तथा सति ब्रह्मणोऽप्राधान्यप्रसङ्गात्। यद्यपि भोग्यसाहित्यपरत्वेऽपि ब्रह्मणोऽप्राधान्यं समानमिति "यश्चोभयोः समो दोषः" इति न्यायावसरः, तथापि तदप्राधान्यं तदीयगुणगणानां भोग्यतातिशयं प्रतिपादयत् ब्रह्मणोऽतिशये पर्यवस्यतीति न दोषाय, प्रत्युत गुणायैव भवति। रत्नानां तारत्म्यातिशयप्रतिपादनं हि रत्नातिशये पर्यवस्यति। यथोक्तमभियुक्तैः—"श्रियं त्वत्तोऽप्युच्चैर्वयमिह भणामः शृणुतराम्" इति। अथवा दहरविद्यायामिवात्रापि गुणानां भोग्यत्वं वक्तुं सहशब्दः। अत्र मुक्तौ ब्रह्मगुणानां भोग्यत्वप्रतिपादनेनोपायभूतमुपासनमपि सगुणस्य ब्रह्मण एवेति चाध्यवसीयते, तत्क्रतुन्यायात्। यदि निर्विशेषं ब्रह्म, तस्य प्रत्यगभिन्नतयोपासनं च प्रतिपिपादयिषितं स्यात्, तदा श्रुतौ प्रत्यगात्मनस्तद्गुणाभावस्य च भोग्यत्ववचनं स्यात्, न तु ब्रह्मणस्तद्गुणानां चेति विभावनीयम्।

स्यादेतत्—तत्क्रतुन्यायो हि उपायदशायामनुसंहितानां धर्माणामुपेयदशायामविनाभावं नियमयति, न त्वधिकधर्माणां तत्र बहिष्कारं वदति। यथोक्तमाचार्यपादैः—

"उपासितगुणादेर्या प्राप्तावप्यबहिष्क्रिया ।
सा तत्क्रतुनयग्राह्या नाकारान्तरवर्जनम् ॥"

इति । अन्यथा विद्याविशेषप्रतिनियतकतिपयगुणविशिष्टतयोपासने मोक्षे परिपूर्णब्रह्मानुभवो न स्यात् । परिपूर्णब्रह्मानुभवो हि 'सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा" इति समस्तगुणविशिष्टब्रह्मानुभवः प्रतिपादितः । अतो निर्विशेषब्रह्मोपासनेऽपि फलदशायां ब्रह्मगुणानुभवो न विरुद्धः । यदपि प्रत्यगभिन्नतयोपासने ब्रह्मानुभवः फलदशायां न युज्यत इति, तदपि न ; यतो ब्रह्मणः प्रत्यगभिन्नतयानुभव एव श्रुत्या प्रतिपाद्यते—ब्रह्मणा विपश्चितेति । तथाहि—ब्रह्मणेति न सहयोगे तृतीया, ब्रह्मपदस्य सहयोगाभावात् । सहेति पदं सर्वान् कामान् सहाश्नुते इत्यन्वयं प्राप्य सर्वेषां कामानां भोगे यौगपद्यं प्रतिपादयति । ब्रह्मणेत्यस्य ब्रह्मभूत इत्यर्थः । उपासकः स्वयं ब्रह्मभूतः सन् सर्वान् कामान् युगपत् अश्नुते, न तु संसारदशायामिव क्रमेणेति । अतो न दोषगन्ध इति ।

अत्रोच्यते—निर्विशेषब्रह्मोपासनेन फलदशायां गुणानुभवप्रतिपादने तत्क्रतुन्यायविरोधो दुरुद्धरः । आचार्यपादोक्तरीत्या विरोधपरिहारस्तु नात्र प्रक्रमते । उपासितगुणाविरुद्धाकारान्तरानुभवस्य संभवदुपपत्तिकत्वेऽपि तद्विरुद्धाकारानुभवोऽसंभावित एव । निर्विशेषत्वेन हि सविशेषत्वं विरुध्यते । यदपि ब्रह्मणेत्यस्य ब्रह्मभूत इति विवरणं, तत्र चिन्त्यते—ब्रह्मणेति तृतीयान्तपदस्य प्रथमान्ततया कथमर्थवर्णनमिति । स्वरसप्राप्ता सहयोगे तृतीया तु परित्यक्ता । ब्रह्मभूत इति विवरणशैलीनिरीक्षणे इत्थंभूतलक्षणे तृतीयात्राभिप्रेतेति

D

प्रतीयते। सा त्वत्र न युज्यते। सा हि इत्थंभूतस्य लक्षणवाचकात् विधीयते, यथा 'जटाभिस्तापसः' इति। न त्वत्र तथा संभवः। प्रकृत्यादिभ्यस्तृतीया तु संबन्धसामान्ये षष्ठ्या प्राप्तायामारब्धेति प्रकृते तदभावान्न प्राप्नोति। अभेदाख्यः संबन्धस्तु नाङ्गीक्रियते। अन्यथा 'नीलमुत्पलम्' इत्यादौ अभेदे संबन्धसामान्ये षष्ठीप्रसङ्गो दुर्वारः। वस्तुतस्तु "प्रकृत्यादिभ्य उपसंख्यानम्" इति वार्तिकस्याकरे प्रत्याख्यातत्वात् तस्याः शङ्काया एवात्र नावसर इति बोध्यम्।

इत्थं वेदान्तोदितेषु तत्त्वहितपुरुषार्थेषु तैस्तैः कौतस्कुतैर्व्याकुलितेषु धर्मत्राणपरायणो भगवान् नारायणो बादरायणात्मनावतीर्य तत्त्वहितपुरुषार्थानौपनिषदान् यथावत् प्रतिष्ठापयितुं चतुर्लक्षणीं ब्रह्ममीमांसां प्रणिनाय। सैषा मीमांसा समन्वयाविरोधसाधनफलानि चतुर्भिरध्यायैः प्रतिपादयन्ती ब्रह्मावबोधे इतिकर्तव्यतात्वमापद्यते। यथाहुः—

> "ज्ञायमाने तु वेदान्तैः करणैः परमात्मनि।
> इमामुत्तरमीमांसामितिकर्तव्यतां विदुः॥"

इति। शास्त्रस्यास्य विषयो ब्रह्म तदुपासनादयश्च। तन्निर्णयः फलम्। अत्र "ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्" इति श्रुतौ "अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा" इति शास्त्रारम्भे च ब्रह्मपदप्रयोगात् जिज्ञासितं ब्रह्म स्वरूपरूपगुणविभवादिभिरपरिच्छिन्नमिति प्रतीयते। ब्रह्मशब्दो हि "बृह बृहि वृद्धौ" इति धातोर्निष्पन्नो ब्रह्मणः स्वरूपतो गुणतश्च निरतिशयबृहत्त्वमाह। तथा च निर्वचनम्— "कस्मादुच्यते ब्रह्म? बृहन्तो ह्यस्मिन् गुणाः"; "बृहति बृंहयति तस्मादुच्यते परं ब्रह्म"; "बृहत्त्वात् बृंहणत्वाच्च तद् ब्रह्मेत्यभिधीयते" इति।

निदिध्यासितं ब्रह्म विस्तरशो निरूपयितुं प्रवृत्ता भगवती श्रुतिः "सदेव सौम्येदमग्र आसीत्। एकमेवाद्वितीयम्" "ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्"

"इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा" "नेह नानास्ति किंचन" इत्यादिवाक्यैर्ब्रह्मणः सत्त्वम् एकत्वम् अद्वितीयत्वं चाभिधाय सर्वं चराचरात्मकं जगत् ब्रह्मरूपमिति बोधयन्ती ब्रह्मणः पृथक् नानाभूतं जगत् नास्तीति निषेधति। एवं "निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निरवद्यं निरञ्जनम्" "निर्गुणम्" इत्यादिकाः श्रुतयो ब्रह्मणो निरवयवत्वं निष्क्रियत्वं निर्गुणत्वं च प्रतिपादयन्ति। एवं श्रुतिषु ब्रह्मभिन्नस्य जगतो नास्तित्वप्रतिपादनात् ब्रह्मणो निर्गुणत्वनिष्क्रियत्वादिप्रतिपादनाच्च ब्रह्म निर्विशेषमिति प्रतीयते। ऐतदात्म्यं च जगतः प्रतिपाद्यमानं जगतो निषेधे पर्यवस्यति, यथा 'रज्ज्वात्मकः सर्पः, शुक्त्यात्मकं रजतम्' इत्यत्र रज्जुतादात्म्यं शुक्तितादात्म्यं च सर्परजतयोरुच्यमानं सर्परजतयोर्निषेधे पर्यवस्यति। अतश्च "एकमेवाद्वितीयम्" इति श्रुतमेकत्वमद्वितीयत्वं च निर्विशेषब्रह्मण इत्यापाततः प्रतीयते। परं तु "यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित् यस्य ज्ञानमयं तपः" "सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पः" "परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च" इत्यादिभिः श्रुतिभिः "तेजोबलैश्वर्यमहावबोधसुवीर्यशक्त्यादिगुणैकराशिः" "तवानन्तगुणस्यापि षडेव प्रथमे गुणाः" इत्यादिभिरुपबृंहणैश्च ब्रह्मणः सविशेषत्वावगमात् पूर्वोक्तमेकत्वमद्वितीयत्वं च सविशेषब्रह्मण इत्यवगम्यते। अतश्चाद्वैतं निर्विशेषाद्वैतं सविशेषाद्वैतमित्यद्वैत एव द्वैतं संपन्नमिति महदिदं वैचित्र्यम्।

तत्र श्रुतिभिः किं निर्विशेषब्रह्माद्वैतं प्रतिपाद्यते, उत सविशेषब्रह्माद्वैतमितीदानीं विचारस्यावसरः। तत्र श्रुतीनां सविशेषब्रह्माद्वैत एव तात्पर्यं, न निर्विशेषब्रह्माद्वैत इति प्रतीयते। तथाहि वेदान्ताः चित्तत्त्वम्, अचित्तत्त्वं ब्रह्मतत्त्वं चेति तत्त्वत्रयं मुक्तकण्ठं निर्दिश्य तेषां तत्त्वानां परस्परवैलक्षण्यं परस्परसंबन्धं च विशदयन्ति। अतो ब्रह्मतत्त्वमिव चिदचित्तत्त्वे अपि न केनाप्यपह्नोतुं शक्येते। तथा तत्त्वत्रयस्य परस्परसंबन्धोऽप्यबाधितप्रमाणसिद्धत्वान्नापह्नवार्हः। श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषदि—

"संयुक्तमेतत् क्षरमक्षरं च व्यक्ताव्यक्तं भरते विश्वमीशः ।
अनीशश्चात्मा बध्यते भोक्तृभावात् ज्ञात्वा देवं मुच्यते सर्वपाशैः ॥"

इति । क्षरमक्षरमीशश्चेति तत्त्वत्रयम् । अत्र क्षरणशीलत्वात् नामरूपविभागार्हस्थूलात्मना परिणामित्वाच्च क्षरमिति व्यक्तमिति चाचित्तत्त्वमुच्यते । अक्षरणशीलत्वात् सूक्ष्मरूपत्वाच्चाव्यक्तमिति चित्तत्त्वं जीववर्ग उच्यते । ईशः परमात्मा व्यक्तरूपं क्षरमचिद्वर्गम् अव्यक्तमक्षरं चिद्वर्गं च संयुक्तं परस्परमिलितं बिभर्ति; केवलमचिद्वर्गं चिद्वर्गं तथा परस्परमिलितं भूतवर्गं च बिभर्तीत्यर्थः । यथोक्तम्—"भर्ता सन् भ्रियमाणो बिभर्ति" "यो लोकत्रयमाविश्य बिभर्त्यव्यय ईश्वरः" इति । अत्र हि लोकत्रयशब्देनाचेतनं तत्संसृष्टश्चेतनो मुक्तश्चेति त्रयमुच्यते । तेषां भरणं च तदन्तरात्मतया तत्स्वरूपस्थितिप्रवृत्तिनिर्वाहकत्वम् । तथा भवन्नपि स न बध्यते । अनीशो जीवस्तु कर्मफलभोक्तृत्वात् बध्यते । परमात्मनस्तु अवाप्तसमस्तकामतया कर्मफलस्पृहाभावात् कर्मलेपो नास्ति । अतो न बन्धप्रसक्तिः । यथोक्तम्—"न मां कर्माणि लिम्पन्ति न मे कर्मफले स्पृहा" इति । देवमीशमित्थं चिदचिद्विलक्षणत्वेन यो जानाति स सर्वपाशैः प्रमुच्यते; सर्वबन्धान्मुक्तो भवतीति चिदचिदीश्वराणां वैलक्षण्यज्ञानस्य मोक्षहेतुत्वमुच्यते । तथा—

"ज्ञाज्ञौ द्वावजावीशनीशावजा ह्येका भोक्तृभोगार्थयुक्ता ।
अनन्तश्चात्मा विश्वरूपो ह्यकर्ता त्रयं यदा विन्दते ब्रह्ममेतत् ।

पूर्ववाक्योक्तयोर्द्वयोः परजीवयोर्मध्ये एक ईशः ज्ञः सर्वज्ञः नियन्ता च । अपरश्चाज्ञोऽनीशो नियाम्यश्च । उत्पत्तिराहित्यं तूभयोः समानम् । ईशनीशाविति सवर्णदीर्घाभावश्छान्दसः । ईशानीशावित्यर्थः । अथवा ईट् चानीट् च ईशनीशाविति जस्त्वाभावश्छान्दसः । अचित्तत्त्वं प्रपञ्च्यते—अजा ह्येकेति । भोक्तुर्जीवस्य भोगरूपप्रयोजनवती अजा उत्पत्तिरहिता एका

अन्या प्रकृतिरित्यर्थः । एवं तत्त्वत्रयमुत्पत्तिरहितत्वेन समानमपि सर्वज्ञत्वा-सर्वज्ञत्वजडत्वादिभिर्धर्मैः परस्परविलक्षणमित्यर्थः । परमात्मनो बन्धाभाव उच्यते—अनन्तश्चेत्यादिना । विश्वशरीरकोऽपि परमात्मा सत्यकामत्वाद्य-नन्तगुणाश्रयः; अत एव निरपेक्षः । अतो जीववत् न फलाभिसन्धिपूर्वक-कर्तृत्ववान् । अतो न तद्भोगार्थत्वं प्रकृतेरिति भावः । एतादृशपरस्परवैल-क्षण्यज्ञानस्य फलमाह—त्रयं यदेति । एतत् त्रिविधं तत्त्वं परस्परविलक्षण-तया यदा जानाति तदा ब्रह्म भवति; प्राकृतनामरूपप्रहाणात् निरस्ततत्कृत-भेदः ज्ञानैकाकारतया ब्रह्मसदृशो ब्रह्मपदवाच्यो भवतीत्यर्थः । प्रकारैक्ये च तत्ताव्यवहारो बहुशो दृष्टः, यथा 'सोऽयं व्रीहिः' इति । न त्वत्र ब्रह्माभेदे तात्पर्यम्, अत्रैव पूर्वं भेदस्य वर्णितत्वात्; "भूयसां स्याद्बलीयस्त्वम्" इति न्यायेन भेदश्रुतीनां बलीयस्त्वात् । एवमादयः श्रुतयोऽवगन्तव्याः ।

तथोपबृंहणान्यपि—

"भूमिरापोऽनलो वायुः खं मनो बुद्धिरेव च ।
अहंकार इतीयं मे भिन्ना प्रकृतिरष्टधा ॥
अपरेयमितस्त्वन्यां प्रकृतिं विद्धि मे पराम् ।
जीवभूतां महाबाहो ययेदं धार्यते जगत् ॥"

अत्र भूम्यादिकमचित्तत्वं जीवाख्यं चित्तत्वं तयोः शेषिभूतमीश्वरतत्त्वं चेति तत्त्वत्रयं तद्वैलक्षण्यं च निर्दिष्टम् । अत्र हि मे इति चेतनाचेतनयोः शेषित्वेनात्मानं निर्दिशति भगवान् । अतः चेतनाचेतनयोः परत्वापरत्वाभ्यां परस्परवैलक्षण्यम्; चेतनाचेतनयोः ईश्वरस्य च शेषत्वशेषित्वाभ्यां वैलक्षण्य-मभिधीयते । तथा—

"यस्मात् क्षरमतीतोऽहमक्षरादपि चोत्तमः ।
अतोऽस्मि लोके वेदे च प्रथितः पुरुषोत्तमः ॥"

"द्वाविमौ पुरुषौ लोके क्षरश्चाक्षर एव च ।
क्षरः सर्वाणि भूतानि कूटस्थोऽक्षर उच्यते ॥
उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः परमात्मेत्युदाहृतः ।
यो लोकत्रयमाविश्य बिभर्त्यव्यय ईश्वरः ॥"

इति । अतः प्रमाणप्रतिपन्नत्वात् ईश्वरतत्त्वमिव चिदचिदाख्यं तत्त्वद्वयमपि दुरपह्नवम् । एवं तेषां तत्त्वानां परस्परवैलक्षण्यस्यापि प्रमाणसिद्धत्वात् तेषां भेदोऽपि दुरपह्नवः ।

तथा—

"न तस्य कार्यं करणं च विद्यते न तत्समश्चाभ्यधिकश्च दृश्यते ।
परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च ॥"

इत्यत्रेश्वरस्य स्वाभाविका ज्ञानशक्तिबलैश्वर्यवीर्यतेजःप्रभृतयोऽनन्ता गुणाः श्रूयन्ते । तस्य "तमीश्वराणां परमं महेश्वरम्" इति पूर्वमन्त्रे निर्दिष्टस्य सर्वेश्वरस्य कार्यं शरीरं करणमिन्द्रियं च न विद्यते; प्राकृतं शरीरं प्राकृतानीन्द्रियाणि च न सन्तीत्यर्थः । तथाचोक्तम्—"न तस्य प्राकृता मूर्तिर्मांसमेदोऽस्थिसंभवा" "न भूतसंघसंस्थानो देहोऽस्य परमात्मनः" इति । तत्समः तदभ्यधिकश्च लोके कश्चिदपि न दृश्यते । अस्य शक्तिः ज्ञानबलाभ्यां सहिता सृष्टिसंहारादिलक्षणा क्रिया च परा इतरविलक्षणा विविधा बहुप्रकारा स्वाभाविकी अनौपाधिकी च श्रूयते; श्रुतिषु बहुशः प्रतिपाद्यत इत्यर्थः । तथा—

"एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः सर्वव्यापी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा ।
कर्माध्यक्षः सर्वभूताधिवासः साक्षी चेता केवलो निर्गुणश्च ॥"
"स विश्वकृद्विश्वविदात्मयोनिर्ज्ञः कालकालो गुणी सर्वविद्यः ।
प्रधानक्षेत्रज्ञपतिर्गुणेशः संसारमोक्षस्थितिबन्धहेतुः ॥"

स ईशः विश्वकृत् सर्वकर्ता । विश्ववित् सर्वं प्राप्तः । लाभार्थकोऽयं विदिः । अवाप्तसमस्तकाम इत्यर्थः । सर्वज्ञत्वस्य ज्ञइत्यनुपदमेव वक्ष्यमाणत्वादय- मेवात्रार्थः । आत्मयोनिः आत्मा जीवः योनिः स्थानं यस्य सः, जीवान्तर्या- मीत्यर्थः । स्वयंभूः, अज इति वा अर्थः । जानातीति ज्ञः ; सर्वज्ञ इत्यर्थः "इगुपधज्ञाप्रीकिरः कः" इति कप्रत्ययः । कालकालः, कालस्यापि नियामकः । "कालं स पचते तत्र न कालस्तत्र वै प्रभुः" इत्यादिकमनु- संधेयम् । गुणी ज्ञानशक्त्यादिकल्याणगुणपरिपूर्णः । सर्वविद्यः सर्वविद्या- प्रवर्तकः । "यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्" इत्युक्तरीत्या सर्वविदिति वा छेदः । प्रधानक्षेत्रज्ञयोः प्रकृतिजीवयोः चिदचितोः पतिः शेषी । गुणेशः ज्ञान- शक्त्यादिभिः गुणैः सर्वमीष्टे इति गुणेशः । संसारस्य प्रकृतिसंबन्ध- लक्षणस्य मोक्षे तत्स्थितिरूपे बन्धे च हेतुरित्यर्थः । "अभीतिरिह यज्जुषां यदवधीरितानां भयम्" इत्युक्तरीत्या प्रपन्नानां मोक्षमितरेषां बन्धं च विदधातीत्यर्थः । अत्रापि भगवतोऽनन्ता गुणा उच्यन्ते ।

तथोपबृंहणेष्वपि—

> समस्तकल्याणगुणात्मकोऽसौ स्वशक्तिलेशोद्धृतभूतवर्गः ।
> इच्छागृहीताभिमतोरुदेहः संसाधिताशेषजगद्धितोऽसौ ॥
> तेजोबलैश्वर्यमहावबोधसुवीर्यशक्त्यादिगुणैकराशिः ।
> परः पराणां सकला न यत्र क्लेशादयः सन्ति परावरेशे ॥"

इत्यादिषु परस्य ब्रह्मणो ज्ञानशक्त्यादयो गुणाः प्रतिपाद्यन्ते ।

एवमनन्तकल्याणगुणमहोदधेः परस्य ब्रह्मणः चिदचितां च शरीरात्म- भावेन संबन्धं प्रतिपादयन्ति श्रुतयः । तथाहि बृहदारण्यके—'यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्' इत्यारभ्य "यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन् विज्ञानादन्तरो यं विज्ञानं न वेद यस्य विज्ञानं शरीरं यो विज्ञानमन्तरो यमयति स त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृतः" इति । अत्र "यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्" इत्यादिना अचेतनानां भगवदधिष्ठि-

तत्वं भगवच्छरीरत्वं "यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन्" इत्यादिना जीवानां भगवदधिष्ठितत्वं भगवच्छरीरत्वं चोक्तम्। परमात्मनः पृथिव्यादिष्ववस्थानं च तत्तदन्तरात्मतयेति दर्शयति—"पृथिव्या अन्तरः, विज्ञानादन्तरः" इति च। अन्तरो यमयतीत्यनेन शरीरलक्षणं सर्वानुगतमुक्तं भवति। अनेन 'यस्य चेतनस्य यत् द्रव्यं सर्वात्मना स्वार्थे नियन्तुं धारयितुं च शक्यं तच्छेषतैकस्वरूपं च तत् तस्य शरीरम्' इति शरीरलक्षणं सिध्यति। चितामचितां चेश्वरेण सर्वात्मना स्वार्थे नियन्तुं धारयितुं च शक्यत्वात् तच्छेषतैकस्वरूपत्वाच्चेश्वरशरीरत्वमव्याहतम्। यः पृथिव्यां स्थितः तदन्तरात्मतया तदन्तर्गतः तदवेद्यः तच्छरीरकश्च सन् तन्नियमनं करोति, एषोऽन्तर्यामी ते अमृत आत्मा, निरुपाधिकामृतत्वशाली आत्मेत्यर्थः। अत्र ते आत्मेति व्यतिरेकषष्ठीनिर्देशात् अन्तर्यामिणो जीवात् व्यतिरेकः सिद्धः। 'शिलापुत्रकस्य शरीरम्' इतिवदयं निर्देश औपचारिक इति तु न शङ्कनीयम्, अपवादकाभावे व्यतिरेकपरषष्ठीनिर्देशस्यौपचारिकत्वकल्पनायोगात्। अभेदे षष्ठी तु न शाब्दिकसंमता। किंचामृतत्वविशेषणादपि व्यतिरेकः सिध्यति। अन्तर्यामी ते आत्मेत्युक्ते आत्मशब्दस्य स्वरूपवाचित्वशङ्कया जीवव्यावृत्तिर्न स्यादिति हि अमृत इत्युक्तम्। एवं "यो विज्ञाने" इत्यादावपि भाव्यम्। अत्रैवान्तर्यामिब्राह्मणे "यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन्" इति काण्वपाठगतविज्ञानशब्दस्य स्थाने माध्यंदिनशाखिनः "य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्" इति पठन्ति। अतोऽत्र विज्ञानशब्दो जीवात्मपर इति विज्ञायते। विजानातीति विज्ञानमिति नन्द्यादित्वात् कर्तरि ल्युः। अथवा स्वप्रकाशत्वात् जीवस्यापि विज्ञानत्वव्यपदेशः।

तथा—"यः पृथिवीमन्तरे संचरन् यस्य पृथिवी शरीरं यं पृथिवी न वेद" इत्यारभ्य "योऽक्षरमन्तरे संचरन् यस्याक्षरं शरीरं यमक्षरं न वेद" इत्यन्यत्रापि जीवस्य परमात्मशरीरत्वं श्रुतम्।

एवं "तत्सृष्ट्वा । तदेवानुप्राविशत् । तदनुप्रविश्य । सच्च त्यच्चाभवत्" इति जगत्सर्गपूर्वकं ब्रह्मणः सर्वत्र व्याप्त्या सर्वशरीरकत्वं श्रूयते । ननु सर्वदा सर्वव्याप्तस्य ब्रह्मणः कोऽसौ सर्गकालेऽनुप्रवेशो नामेति चेत्—अत्राहुः—गोजठरगतवत्सवत् सर्वव्याप्तस्य ब्रह्मणः प्रत्येकं सर्ववस्तुषु पुष्कलप्रतीत्यर्हस्थितिविशेष एवात्रानुप्रवेशः । अनेन "सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म" इत्यपरिच्छिन्नतयोक्तस्य ब्रह्मणः "यो वेद निहितं गुहायाम्" इत्यत्र हृदयगुहानिहितत्वोक्तिरप्युपपादिता भवति ।

तस्मात् श्रुत्यादिभिः प्रमाणैः प्रसिध्यत् परं ब्रह्म चिदचिच्छरीरकत्वसर्वान्तर्यामित्वसत्यकामत्वसत्यसंकल्पत्वनिरतिशयषाड्गुण्यादिविशेषविशिष्टमेव प्रसिध्यतीति सविशेषाद्वैतपराण्येव पूर्वोक्तवचनानि न निर्विशेषाद्वैतपराणीति विशिष्टाद्वैतिनां सिद्धान्तः ।

एवं सविशेषब्रह्माद्वैताभिप्रायकत्वात् विशिष्टाद्वैतमिति व्यपदेशः । अयं भावः—ब्रह्मैकमेव तत्त्वमिति वैशिष्ट्याभिप्रायेण व्यपदेशः । निष्कर्षे तु तत्त्वत्रयमेवेति । शरीरशरीरिभावरूपं प्रतितन्त्रसिद्धान्तमवलम्ब्य भेदश्रुतयोऽभेदश्रुतयश्च सामञ्जस्येनोपपादयितुं शक्यन्ते । अन्यथा भेदश्रुतीनां काल्पनिकं भेदमादायोपपत्तिर्वर्णनीया । तथोपपत्तिवर्णनं तु तासां श्रुतीनामप्रामाण्यकल्पनाकल्पमिति वदन्ति ।

सिद्धान्तमिममवलम्ब्यैव भगवता भाष्यकृता ब्रह्मसूत्राणि वेदान्तसारे विवृतानि । अध्यायानां पादानां चार्थसंग्रहस्तु आङ्गलभाषोपोद्धाते तल्लेखकैः कृत इति विरम्यते ।

वे. कृष्णमाचार्यः

E

विषयानुक्रमणी

प्रथमाध्यायः

प्रथमपादः

द्वितीयपादः

तृतीयपादः

अधि.		सूत्राणि
६	आप्रयाणाधिकरणम्	१
७	तदधिगमाधिकरणम्	१
८	इतराधिकरणम्	१
९	अनारब्धकार्याधिकरणम्	१
१०	अग्निहोत्राद्यधिकरणम्	३
११	इतरक्षपणाधिकरणम्	१
११		१९

द्वितीयपादः

अधि.		सूत्राणि
१	वागधिकरणम्	२
२	मनोऽधिकरणम्	१
३	अध्यक्षाधिकरणम्	१
४	भूताधिकरणम्	२
५	आसृत्युपक्रमाधिकरणम्	७
६	परसंपत्त्यधिकरणम्	१
७	अविभागाधिकरणम्	१
८	तदोकोऽधिकरणम्	१
९	रश्म्यनुसाराधिकरणम्	१
१०	निशाधिकरणम्	१
११	दक्षिणायनाधिकरणम्	२
११		२०

तृतीयपादः

अधि.		सूत्राणि
१	अर्चिराद्यधिकरणम्	१
२	वाय्वधिकरणम्	१
३	वरुणाधिकरणम्	१
४	आतिवाहिकाधिकरणम्	२
५	कार्याधिकरणम्	१०
५		१५

चतुर्थपादः

अधि.		सूत्राणि
१	संपद्याविर्भावाधिकरणम्	३
२	अविभागेनदृष्टत्वाधिकरणम्	१
३	ब्राह्माधिकरणम्	३
४	संकल्पाधिकरणम्	२
५	अभावाधिकरणम्	७
६	जगद्व्यापारवर्जाधिकरणम्	६
६		२२

आहत्य=१५६ आहत्य=५४५

सौत्री संख्या शुभाशीरधिकृति-
गणना चिन्मयी ब्रह्मकाण्डे ।
(अधिकरणसारावली, १६)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

श्रीः

श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचितः

वेदान्तसारः

प्रथमाध्याये प्रथमः पादः

जिज्ञासाधिकरणम् १

समस्तचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरायाखिलात्मने ।
श्रीमते निर्मलानन्दोदन्वते विष्णवे नमः ॥

VEDĀNTASĀRA

OF

S'RĪ-RĀMĀNUJA

ADHYĀYA I, PĀDA I

JIJÑĀSĀDHIKARAṆA 1

I BOW unto Viṣṇu,[1] who has as his body all the sentient and non-sentient beings, who is the self of all objects, who is associated with S'rī and who is the ocean of bliss untainted with impurity.

[1] The Supreme God in Vis'iṣṭādvaita philosophy and religion.

परमपुरुषप्रसादात् वेदान्तसार[1] उद्ध्रियते—

अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा ॥ १ ॥

अत्रायमथशब्द आनन्तर्ये वर्तते, अतःशब्दशिरस्कत्वात्। अतः-शब्दश्च पूर्ववृत्तस्य हेतुभावे। पूर्ववृत्तं च कर्मज्ञानमिति विज्ञायते, आरिप्सितस्य ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य वेदार्थविचारैकदेशत्वात्। अधीतवेदस्य हि पुरुषस्य, कर्मप्रतिपादनोपक्रमत्वाद्वेदानां, कर्मविचारः प्रथमं कार्य इति "अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासा" इत्युक्तम्। कर्मणां च प्रकृतिविकृतिरूपाणां

Vedāntasāra or the quintessence of Vedānta is extracted and offered to the public by the grace of the Highest Person.

1. *Athāto Brahma-jijñāsā.*

Then therefore the inquiry into the *Brahman.*

Here the word, *then* is used in the sense of *coming thereafter*, because it is followed by the word *therefore* The word, *therefore*, is used in the sense of causation of that which has been concluded previously. What has been concluded previously, is understood to be the knowledge of ritualistic works; because the inquiry into the Brahman, which is desired to be commenced here, happens to be a portion of the inquiry into the meaning of the *Vedās*. Indeed, for the person, who has completed his study of the *Vedās*, the first duty is to make an inquiry into the ritualistic works, as the *Vedās* commence to deal with them in the beginning. Hence it is stated "Then therefore the inquiry into the Dharma" (*Mīm*. 1. 1. 1). Taking the topic of Dharma separately, it is determined in the series of *Sūtras* ending with "[2] The priestly function must be common for all the castes as all are able to do it" (*Mīm*. 12-4-40) that

[1] सारार्थ. A 1, M 1. [2] This is the Pūrvapakṣasūtra of the last Adhikaraṇa.

धर्मार्थकामरूपपुरुषार्थसाधनतानिश्चयः "प्रभुत्वादार्त्विज्यम्" इत्यन्तेन सूत्रकलापेन संकर्षेण[1] कृतः ।

एवं वेदस्यार्थपरत्वे कर्मणां च तदर्थत्वे तेषां च केवलानां त्रिवर्गफलत्वे निश्चिते सति, वेदैकदेशभूतवेदान्तभागे केवलकर्मणामल्पास्थिरफलत्वं ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य चानन्तस्थिरफलत्वमापाततो दृष्ट्वा, अनन्तरं मुमुक्षोरवधारितपरिनिष्पन्नवस्तुबोधजननशब्दशक्तेः पुरुषस्य ब्रह्मबुभुत्सा जायत इति 'अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा' इति कर्मविचारानन्तरं तत एव हेतोर्ब्रह्मविचारः कर्तव्य इत्युक्तं भवति ।

the rituals of Prakṛti and Vikṛti kinds[2] are only the means to attain the three-fold object of human pursuit *viz.* Dharma (*i.e.* ritualistic works), *Artha* (*i.e.* wealth) and *Kāma* (*i.e.* gratification of desire).

The *Vedās* naturally imply their meaning. The ritualistic works are their meaning. It is also determined that these mere works can grant only the three-fold object of human pursuit stated above. It is roughly realised in *Vedânta*, which is a portion of the *Vedās*, that the ritualistic works give only small and transitory results and the Brahman-realization only can produce infinite and eternal results. Then, in the person, who wants to attain *Mokṣa* (*i.e.* final release), and who has determined

[1] ससंकर्षेण M 2, M 4, संकर्षणेन M 1, M 3.

संकर्षेण आकर्षेण; वेदार्थविचाररूपसामान्यविषयात् कर्मविचारस्य पृथक्करणेनेत्यर्थः। पृथक्करणं च तस्य विस्तरेण प्रतिपादनाय। अत एवात्र सूत्रकलापेनेत्युक्तिः। अत्र धर्मविचारस्य पृथक्करण च बहुग्रन्थप्रतिपाद्यत्वादिति श्रुतप्रकाशिकासवादोऽप्यनुसंधेयः। संकर्षणेनेति पाठेऽप्ययमेवार्थः। ससंकर्षेणेति पाठे संकर्षाख्यदेवताकाण्डसहितेनेत्यर्थः।

[2] The Prakṛti is that, of which details are fully mentioned in the code. The Vikṛti is that, of which details are not fully mentioned in the code, but have to be borrowed from the Prakṛti.

तदिदमाह श्रुतिः—"परीक्ष्य लोकान् कर्मचितान् ब्राह्मणो निर्वेद-मायान्नास्त्यकृतः कृतेन । तद्विज्ञानार्थं स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत्समित्पाणिः श्रोत्रियं ब्रह्मनिष्ठम् । तस्मै स विद्वानुपसन्नाय सम्यक् प्रशान्तचित्ताय शमान्विताय । येनाक्षरं पुरुषं वेद सत्यं प्रोवाच तां तत्त्वतो ब्रह्मविद्याम् ।" इति । ब्राह्मणः=वेदाभ्यासरतः । कर्मचितान् कर्मणा संपादितान् लोकान् आराध्यक्षयिष्णुत्वेन क्षयस्वभावान् कर्ममीमांसया परीक्ष्य । अकृतः नित्यः

that words can denote even the objects that have been already in existence, the desire to know the *Brahman* springs up. Therefore, it is stated in the *Sūtra*, "Then therefore the inquiry into the Brahman" (*Br. S.* I-1-1) that after the inquiry of Karman, by the very same reason the inquiry into the *Brahman* is to be made.

Here is the scriptural statement thus—'Having examined the worlds obtained by works, let a *Brāhmaṇa* acquire distaste on ritualistic works, as the object which is not in the scope of being effected could not be gained by action; to know that object let him approach with sacred fuel in hand necessarily a preceptor, who is learned in the *Vedās* and has a steady footing in the *Brahman*. To him (*i.e.* to such a pupil) who with tranquil mind and restrained senses has thus approached, that wise person (the *guru*) should speak of the knowledge about the *Brahman* by which he (the pupil) can know the ever-existing and indestructible Puruṣa (person)' (*Muṇḍ.* 1-2-12 & 13). Here the *Brāhmaṇa* is one, who is engaged in the study of the Vedās. The word *Karmacitān* means 'gained through the works'. The word *worlds* (lokān) means to imply 'those worlds that are destructible by nature as the

परमपुरुषः कृतेन कर्मणा न संपाद्य इति यो निर्वेदमायात्, स तद्विज्ञानार्थं गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत् समित्पाणिः श्रोत्रियं वेदान्तवेदिनं ब्रह्मनिष्ठं साक्षात्कृतपरमपुरुषस्वरूपम् । स गुरुः सम्यगुपसन्नाय तस्मै येन विद्याविशेषेण अक्षरं सत्यं परमपुरुषं विद्यात्, तां ब्रह्मविद्यां प्रोवाच प्रब्रूयादित्यर्थः । स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत्, तस्मै स विद्वान् प्रोवाचेत्यन्वयात् अप्राप्तत्वाच्च; विधावपि लिटो विधानात्—"छन्दसि लुङ्लङ्लिटः" इति ॥

deities worshipped are destructible'. He should determine thus on inquiry into Karman—'The Highest Person who is eternal can not be attainable by works' He (*i e.* the pupil) then acquires distaste in all worldly objects. To know That (*Brahman*) he should approach the preceptor alone with fuel in hand. The word, '*śrotriya*' means, 'one who is learned in the *Vedās* up to the end'. The words 'who has a steady footing in the *Brahman*' mean 'One who has apprehended the true nature of the Highest Person'. Then he (the preceptor) should speak of the knowledge of the *Brahman* to him (the pupil) who approached him properly, with which knowledge the pupil can know the Eternal Highest Person. The perfect tense in the word *Provāca* should be taken to mean the injunction, because of the construction—'The pupil should approach the preceptor alone and the learned preceptor should teach him'. More over, the teaching by the preceptor is not known ordained otherwise. The perfect tense is ordained in the sense of injunction by the rule—'In Veda, the aorist, imperfect and perfect tenses are used in other senses also'. (*Pāṇ.* 3-4-6).

जन्माद्यधिकरणम् २

जन्माद्यस्य यतः ॥ २ ॥

अस्य विचित्रचिदचिन्मिश्रस्य व्यवस्थितसुखदुःखोपभोगस्य जगतो जन्मस्थितिलया यतः, तद् ब्रह्मेति प्रतिपादयति श्रुतिरित्यर्थः ; "यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते । येन जातानि जीवन्ति । यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति । तद्विजिज्ञासस्व । तद् ब्रह्मेति" इति । सूत्रे यत इति हेतौ पञ्चमी, जनिस्थितिलयानां साधारणत्वात् । जनिहेतुत्वं च निमित्तोपादान-

JANMĀDYADHIKARAṆA 2

2. *Janmādyasya yataḥ.*

(The *Brahman* is He) from whom (proceed) the creation, etc. of this Universe.

The scriptural text is this—'From whom all these beings are born; by whom, when born, they are all preserved and to whom they go back when they perish—do you desire to know that well, that is the *Brahman*'. (*Tait.* III-1-1). The meaning of the *Sūtra* is thus—The Vedic text declares that it is the *Brahman*, from whom proceed the creation, the sustenance and the destruction of the world—this world is a mixture of various sentient and non-sentient beings whose enjoyment of the pleasure and pain, has been settled. In this *Sūtra*, the word, 'from whom' is used in the ablative case to mean the causality in general; because it is applied in common to the creation, sustenance, and destruction (of the universe). His causality in production includes his being the efficient cause as well as the material cause. It is so, because the Vedic statement 'From whom etc.' is common to both.

रूपं विवक्षितम् । 'यतः' इति हि श्रुतिरुभयविषया । कथमिति चेत्, 'यतो वा इमानि' इति प्रसिद्धवन्निर्देशात्; प्रसिद्धेश्चोभयविषयत्वात् । "सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् + तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति । तत्तेजोऽसृजत" इत्यत्र सदेवेदमग्र एकमेवासीदित्युपादानतां प्रतिपाद्य, अद्वितीयमित्यधिष्ठात्रन्तरनिवारणात् सच्छब्दवाच्यं ब्रह्मैव निमित्तमुपादानं चेति विज्ञायते । "तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इत्यात्मन एव विचित्रस्थिरत्रसरूपेण बहुभवनं संकल्प्य तथैव सृष्टिवचनाच्च । अतः श्रुतावपि 'यतः' इति हेतौ पञ्चमी ।

To the question—how is it? the reply is this—There is a clear reference to Him as being the cause of the creation, etc. (of the world) in the expression 'from whom etc.' as if He were a well-known celebiated Being His celebrity includes the twofold causation said above. (Consider) the text 'Existence alone, my dear boy, this was in the beginning one only, without a second . . . It thought 'May I become many and be born'. It created *Tejas*' (*Chānd.* VI-2-1 & 3). Here the expression 'Existence alone this was in the begnning one only' proves that He is the material cause (of the Universe). The expression 'without a second' refutes a different substratum. Hence it becomes known that the *Brahman*, who is denoted by the word 'existence' is both the efficient cause and the material cause (of the Universe). It is known also from the scriptual text "It thought 'May I become many and be born" that He did resolve to assume many variegated forms of sentient and non-sentient beings and then He did create (the Universe). Therefore the expression 'from whom' is used in the scripture with the ablative case in this sense of causality in general.

अत्रैव—ब्रह्मणो जगन्निमित्तत्वमुपादानत्वं च प्रतिपादितमर्थविरोधात् "अस्मान्मायी सृजते विश्वमेतत्" इत्यादिविशेषश्रुत्या चाक्षिप्य "प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्, अभिध्योपदेशाच्च, साक्षाच्चोभयाम्नानात्, आत्मकृतेः" इत्यादिभिः सूत्रैः परिहरिष्यते ।

ननु च सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्ति सत्यसंकल्पं निरवद्यतया निरस्तसमस्तापुरुषार्थगन्धं ब्रह्मैवात्मानं विचित्रचिदचिन्मिश्रं जगद्रूपमिदं सर्वमसृजतेति कथमुपपद्यते ? तदेतत् सूत्रकारः स्वयमेव परिचोद्य परिहरिष्यति । "अपीतौ तद्वत्प्रसङ्गादसमञ्जसम्" "इतरव्यपदेशाद्धिताकरणादिदोषप्रसक्तिः" इति चोद्यम् । परिहारस्तु—"न तु दृष्टान्तभावात्" "अधिकं तु भेदनिर्देशात्"

In this text (Brahmasūtra) itself the fact that the *Brahman* is both the material cause and the efficient cause (of the Universe) has been objected on the ground of logical contradiction and of the specific statement in the Vedic text, viz. "The magician created the Universe from this" (*S'vet.* IV-1-9) and subsequently maintained after refuting the objection in the *Sūtras* I-4-23 to 26.

How then does the *Brahman*—who is omniscient and omnipotent, who wills the truth and who has discarded all things unworthy to be of human pursuit as He himself being not tainted with evil—create the Universe, which is a mixture of various wonderful sentient and non-sentient beings? The author of the *Sūtras*[1] himself will raise this objection and answer it. He raises the objection in *Sūtras* II-1-8 and II-1-21 and answers it in *Sūtras* II-1-9 and II-1-22.

The individual self is declared to be distinct from the *Brahman* in the series of scriptural texts and smṛti passages stated below :—

[1] Bādarāyaṇa is called the author of the *Sūtras* here.

इति च। "क्षरं त्वविद्या ह्यमृतं तु विद्या विद्याविद्ये ईशते यस्तु सोऽन्यः" "स कारणं करणाधिपाधिपो न चास्य कश्चिज्जनिता न चाधिपः" "क्षरं प्रधानममृताक्षरं हरः क्षरात्मानावीशते देव एकः"। अचिद्वर्गं स्वात्मनो भोग्यत्वेन हरतीति भोक्ता हर इत्युच्यते।

"द्वाविमौ पुरुषौ लोके क्षरश्चाक्षर एव च।
क्षरः सर्वाणि भूतानि कूटस्थोऽक्षर उच्यते॥
उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः परमात्मेत्युदाहृतः।
यो लोकत्रयमाविश्य बिभर्त्यव्यय ईश्वरः॥

'The destructible is the *Avidyā* or action. The immortal is the *Vidyā* or knowledge. He (the *Brahman*), who commands the *Vidyā* and the *Avidyā* is distinct from the soul.' (*S've.* 5-1).

'He is the cause. He is the lord of the lord of the senses (*i.e.* of the *Jīva* or the individual self). He has neither progenitor nor master' (*S've.* VI-9).

'The destructible is the *Pradhāna* or *Prakṛti*; the immortal and the indestructible is the *Hara* (*i.e.* the individual self) and the Lord alone rules over the destructible *Prakṛti* and the individual self' (*S've.* I-10).

The enjoying soul is said *Hara* because he takes the non-sentient things for his enjoyment.

'These are two *Puruṣas* in the world, the destructible and the indestructible. The destructible represents all beings, while the indestructible is said to be the unchanging one' (*Bh. Gītā* XV-16). But other than these, is the Highest *Puruṣa* called the Supreme Soul, who as the eternal Lord, supports the three worlds, having entered them. (*Bh. Gītā* XV-17).

यस्मात् क्षरमतीतोऽहमक्षरादपि चोत्तमः ।
अतोऽस्मि लोके वेदे च प्रथितः पुरुषोत्तमः ॥"

इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिगणेन प्रत्यगात्मनो भेदेन ब्रह्मणो निर्देशादपुरुषार्थभागिनः प्रत्यगात्मनोऽधिकमर्थान्तरभूतं ब्रह्म । तच्च प्रत्यगात्मशरीरकतया तदात्मभूतम् ।

प्रत्यगात्मनस्तच्छरीरत्वं ब्रह्मणस्तदात्मत्वं च "य आत्मनि तिष्ठन् + यस्यात्मा शरीरम्" "एष सर्वभूतान्तरात्मापहतपाप्मा दिव्यो देव एको नारायणः" इत्यादिश्रुतिशतसमधिगतम् । सशरीरस्यात्मनः कार्यावस्थाप्राप्तावपि गुणदोषव्यवस्थितेर्दृष्टान्तभावात् ब्रह्मणि न दोषप्रसक्तिरिति नासामञ्जस्यं वेदान्तवाक्यस्येति "न तु दृष्टान्तभावात्" इत्युक्तम् ।

Because I transcend the destructible beings and am also higher than the indestructible *Jīva*, am I celebrated in the world and in the *Veda* as the Supreme Person (*Bh. Gītā* XV-18).

The *Brahman* is Superior than and distinct from the individual self, who experiences distress and sorrow which are not fit to be the scope of human pursuit. The *Brahman* has for His body the individual selves and He is their Self. This fact has been established by hundreds of scriptural passages such as (*a*) " Remaining in the self + has the self as His body " (*Mādhy*-) and (*b*) " He is the inner self of all beings ; He is devoid of all pains ; He is the Divine Lord ; He is the only one God *Nārāyaṇa* (*Sub.* VII). Though the embodied soul assumes the state of an effect, yet he is not tainted with evils of the effect, because the good and bad attributes are restricted in each case. There are illustrative examples for this. Therefore the *Brahman* is not tainted with evils. Hence there is no absurdity in the passages of Vedānta. This has been asserted in *Sūtra* 2-1-9. The illustrative example is

दृष्टान्तश्च देवमनुष्यादिशब्दवाच्यस्य सशरीरस्यात्मनः 'मनुष्यो बालो युवा स्थविरः' इति नानावस्थाप्राप्तावपि बालत्वयुवत्वस्थविरत्वादयः शरीरगता दोषा नात्मानं स्पृशन्ति, आत्मगताश्च ज्ञानसुखादयो न शरीरमिति। अतः कार्यावस्थं कारणावस्थं च ब्रह्म प्रत्यगात्मशरीरकतया तदात्मभूतमिति प्रत्यगात्मवाचिना शब्देन ब्रह्माभिधाने तच्छब्दसामानाधिकरण्ये च हेतुं वक्तुं निरसनीयं मतद्वयं "प्रतिज्ञासिद्धेर्लिङ्गमाश्मरथ्यः। उत्क्रमिष्यत एवंभावादित्यौडुलोमिः" इत्युपन्यस्य "अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः" इति हेतुरुक्तः। "तत्सृष्ट्वा। तदेवानुप्राविशत्। तदनुप्रविश्य। सच्च त्यच्चाभवत्" इत्यादिना प्रत्यगात्मन आत्मतयावस्थानात् ब्रह्मणस्तच्छब्देनाभिधानं तत्सामानाधिकरण्येन व्यपदेशश्चेत्युक्तम्।

this.—The self, that has a body, is denoted by various words, such as god, man etc. It assumes the various states of child-hood, youth, old age, etc. Yet the child-hood, youth, old age etc. are the faults that are attached to the body. They do not touch the self. In the same way the pleasure etc. that are closely attached to the self, do not touch the body. Therefore, the *Brahman*, both in the states of effect and cause, has the individual souls as His body and is the Self of those individual souls. Therefore the *Brahman* is denoted by the word, denoting the individual soul. Then it is right to state that the word, soul applies to the *Brahman*, because the *Brahman* and the individual selves co-exist in the same grammatical equation. In order to reason this fact, two other schools that have to be refuted have been stated in *Sūtras* I-4-20 and 21 and the Siddhānta views of reasoning are advanced in *sūtra* I-4-22. In the scriptural text, 'Having created it, He entered into it; having entered into it, He became the sentient and the

तथा "वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये न सापेक्षत्वात्। न कर्माविभागादिति चेन्नानादित्वादुपपद्यते चाप्युपलभ्यते च" इति देवमनुष्यादिविषमसृष्टेर्जीवकर्मनिमित्तत्वं जीवानां तत्तत्कर्मप्रवाहाणां चानादित्वं च प्रतिपाद्य, तदनादित्वं च "नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानाम्" "ज्ञाज्ञौ द्वौ" इत्यादिश्रुतिषूपलभ्यत इत्युक्त्वा, तदनादित्वेऽपि प्रलयकाले चिदचिद्वस्तुनोर्भोक्तृभोग्ययोर्नामरूपविभागाभावात् "आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्। नान्यत् किञ्चन मिषत्" इत्यादावेकत्वावधारणमुपपद्यत इति सूत्रकारेण स्वयमेवोक्तम्।

non-sentient beings.' (*Tait.* II-6-1), it is seen that He remains in the position of the Self to all individual selves. Hence, the *Brahman* is denoted by the word, denoting the individual soul. It is also stated that He is mentioned as being co-extensive in the same grammatical equation with the individual soul. The inequalities in creation as god, men, etc. are caused by the *Karmans* done by the individual selves. This is asserted in *Sūtra*, II-1-34. The individual souls and the stream of *Karmans* that is attached to them, have not a beginning. This is asserted in *Sūtra* 2-1-35. That they have not a beginning has been established in the following scriptural texts, " The Eternal among eternals, the Intelligent among the intelligents " (*S've.* VI-13). " The two, namely, the Intelligent and non-intelligent' (*S've.* I-9). Though they have not a beginning, yet at the time of the deluge *i.e. Pralaya*, the sentient and the non-sentient beings, that assume the form of the enjoyer and the enjoyed can not be distinguished by the distinct names and forms. The *Sūtrakāra* has himself stated that the stress of oneness of the *Brahman* is reasonable. The scriptural text quoted here is this—" Indeed the Self alone was in the beginning and nothing else " (*Ait.* 1. I-1).

तथाच "नात्मा श्रुतेर्नित्यत्वाच्च ताभ्यः" इति प्रत्यगात्मनो नित्यत्वादनुत्पत्तिमुक्त्वा "ज्ञोऽत एव" इति तस्य ज्ञातृत्वमेव स्वरूपमित्युक्तम्। "उत्क्रान्तिगत्यागतीनाम्" इत्यादिना तस्याणुत्वं चोक्तम्। "तद्गुणसारत्वात्तु तद्व्यपदेशः प्राज्ञवत्। यावदात्मभावित्वाच्च न दोषस्तद्दर्शनात्" इति ज्ञातुरेवात्मनो ज्ञानशब्देन व्यपदेशो ज्ञानगुणसारत्वात् ज्ञानैकनिरूपणीयस्वभावत्वाच्चेत्युक्तम्। "नित्योपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धिप्रसङ्गोऽन्यतरनियमो वान्यथा" इति ज्ञानमात्रस्वरूपात्मवादे हेत्वन्तरायत्तज्ञानात्मवादे[1] सर्वगतात्मवादे च दोष उक्तः। "कर्ता शास्त्रार्थवत्त्वात्। उपादानाद्विहारोपदेशाच्च। व्यपदेशाच्च क्रियायां न चेन्निर्देशविपर्ययः। उपलब्धिवदनियमः। शक्तिविपर्ययात्। समाध्यभावाच्च। यथा च तक्षोभयथा।" इत्यात्मन एव

That the self is eternal and not produced has been proved in *Sūtra* II-3-18. That knowledge is the essential characteristic of the self has been proved in *Sūtra* II-3-19. That the self is atomic in size has been proved in *Sūtra* II-3-20. The self, who is the knower, has been mentioned by the term knowledge; because he has knowledge, as his essential attribute and because also he has to be defined and investigated by the means of the attribute, knowledge. This has been stated in *Sūtras* 11-3-29 & 30. In the *Sūtra* II-3-32 are stated the defects that arise in the schools that accept knowledge as the self, that accept the knowledge produced by other means as the self and that accept the self as being present everywhere. That the self is the doer of good and bad works and not *Prakṛti* has been stated in *Sūtras* II-3-33 to 39.

[1] ज्ञानवादे A. 1.

शुभाशुभेषु कर्मसु कर्तृत्वम्; प्रकृतेरकर्तृत्वम्; प्रकृतेश्च कर्तृत्वे तस्याः साधारणत्वेन सर्वेषां फलानुभवप्रसङ्गादि च प्रतिपादितम्। "परात्तु तच्छ्रुतेः। कृतप्रयत्नापेक्षस्तु विहितप्रतिषिद्धावैयर्थ्यादिभ्यः।" इत्यात्मन एव कर्तृत्वं परमपुरुषानुमतिसहकृतमित्युक्तम्।

"अंशो नानाव्यपदेशादन्यथा चापि दाशकितवादित्वमधीयत एके। मन्त्रवर्णात्। अपि च स्मर्यते। प्रकाशादिवत्तु नैवं परः। स्मरन्ति च।" इति, "अनीशया शोचति मुह्यमानः। जुष्टं यदा पश्यत्यन्यमीशमस्य महिमानमेति वीतशोकः" "क्षरं त्वविद्या ह्यमृतं तु विद्या विद्याविद्ये ईशते यस्तु

Suppose the *Prakṛti* is the doer, then this *Prakṛti* happens to remain common to all the individual selves. As such, all the individual selves must enjoy the fruits thereof. In *Sūtras* II-3-40 & 41, it is stated that the effert of the self has the approval of the Highest Person.

The inherent property and the natural state of the self has been stated to be many. They are—(*a*) dependent on *Karman*, (*b*) subject to affliction, (*c*) not all knowing, (*d*) his *Mukti* (or final liberation) is dependant upon the means of worship. That of the Brahman is stated to be (*a*) not tainted with faults, (*b*) all knowing, (*c*) Possessed of true will, (*d*) lord of all beings, The authorities are:

1. *Brahma-Sūtras* II-3-42 to 46.

2. 'The *Puruṣa i.e.* the individual self sits immersed in grief, and being ignorant and powerless, he feels sorry; when he sees another, the Lord, well worshipped, then he being relieved from grief, attains His greatness' (*S've.* IV-7).

3. 'The destructible is the *Avidyā* or *Karman* and the immortal is the *Vidyā* or knowledge and He (the *Brahman*) who commands them is distinct' (*S've.* 5. 1).

सोऽन्यः" "प्राज्ञेनात्मना संपरिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किंचन वेद नान्तरम्" "तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्यो अभिचाकशीति" "ज्ञाज्ञौ द्वावजावीशनीशौ" "पृथगात्मानं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा जुष्टस्ततस्तेनामृतत्वमेति" "यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम्। तदा विद्वान् पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति" "स कारणं करणाधिपाधिपो न चास्य कश्चिज्जनिता न चाधिपः" "यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्" "परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया

4. 'Being embraced by the Intelligent Self, he knows neither the external thing nor the internal thing.' (Br IV-3-21).

5. 'One of them eats the sweet *Pippala* fruit, while the other shines in splendour withou teating at all' (*Muṇd.* III-1-1).

6. 'The two unborn, the Intelligent and the non-intelligent are the lord and non-lord' (*S've.* I-9).

7. 'By knowing the individual self and the Impeller to be different, he, being blessed by Him attains immortality' (*S've.* I-6).

8. 'When the seer beholds Him, the golden-coloured, the creator, the Lord, the Person and the cause of the Matter, then the wise not tainted with evils, becomes entirely equal to Him, having discarded *Puṇya* and *Pāpa* (*i.e.* the effects of good and bad deeds)' (*Muṇd.* III-1-3).

9. 'He is the cause. He is the Lord of the lord of the senses (*i.e.* the individual self). He has neither generator nor master' (*S've.* VI-9).

10. 'He who understands all and knows all' (*Mund.* I-1-9).

11. 'His supreme power is proclaimed, indeed, as varied and natural and consisting of activity provoked by knowledge and strength' (*S've.* VI-8).

च" "निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निरवद्यं निरञ्जनम्" "नित्यो नित्यानां[1] चेतनश्चेतनानामेको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान्"। नित्यानां बहूनां चेतनानां य एको नित्यश्चेतनः कामान् विदधातीत्यर्थः। "पतिं विश्वस्यात्मेश्वरम्" इत्यादिषु प्रत्यगात्मनः परमात्मनश्च कर्मवश्यत्वेन शोचितृत्वेनासर्वज्ञत्वेनोपासनायत्तमुक्तित्वेन निरवद्यत्वेन सर्वज्ञत्वेन सत्यसंकल्पत्वेन सर्वेश्वरत्वेन समस्तकल्याणगुणाकरत्वादिना च स्वरूपस्वभावनानात्वव्यपदेशात्। तयोरेव "तत्त्वमसि" "अयमात्मा ब्रह्म" "योऽसौ सोऽहं, योऽहं सोऽसौ" "अथ योऽन्यां देवतामुपास्ते अन्योऽसावन्योऽहमस्मीति न स वेद" "अकृत्स्नो ह्येषः + आत्मेत्येवोपासीत" "ब्रह्म दाशा

12. 'He is without parts, without action, tranquil and without defect, without taint' (*S've.* VI-19).

13. 'He, who is the Eternal among the eternals, the Intelligent among the intelligents, fulfils the desires of many, being Himself only one' (*S've.* VI-13).

14. 'He is the Lord of the entire world, and the master of one's Self' (*Mahā. Nār.* I-3).

The *Brahman* pervades all the individual souls. Therefore He is mentioned as one with them. The authorities are :—

(1) 'That thou art' (*Chānd.* VI-8-7).

(2) 'This self is the *Brahman*' (*Bṛ.* VI-4-5).

(3) 'Therefore whatever that (deity) is, that am I and whatever I am, that is that (deity)' (*Ait. Ār.* II-2-46).

(4) 'And then he, who worships that deity who is distinct, thinking that (that deity) is separate and he (the worshipper) is separate, he does not know the truth' (*Bṛ.* I-4-10).

(5) 'This (the Jīva) is imperfect + should worship Him (the *Brahman*) as his self' (*Bṛ.* I-4-7).

[1] अनित्यानामिति छित्वा व्याख्यान्तरं कृतमुपनिषद्भाष्ये.

ब्रह्म दासा ब्रह्मेमे कितवाः" इति च सर्वजीवात्मव्यापित्वेनाभेदव्यपदेशाच्चो-भयव्यपदेशाविरोधेन परमात्मांशो जीवात्मेत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम्। न केवलं न्यायसिद्धमिदम्। श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यां चांशत्वमुक्तं जीवात्मनः—"पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि" "ममैवांशो जीवलोके जीवभूतः सनातनः" इति।

अंशत्वं नामैकवस्त्वेकदेशत्वम्। तथा सत्युभयोरेकवस्तुत्वेन विशेषो[1] न स्यादित्याशङ्क्य "प्रकाशादिवत्तु नैवं परः" इति परिहरति। अन्य-विशेषणतैकस्वभावप्रकाशजातिगुणशरीरविशिष्टान् अग्निव्यक्तिगुण्यात्मनः प्रति प्रकाशजातिगुणशरीराणां यथा ह्यंशत्वम्, एवं परमात्मानं प्रत्यगात्मशरीरकं

(6) 'The *Brahman* are the fishermen, the *Brahman* are the slaves, the Brahman are these gamblers' (*Brahmasūkta*).

Therefore, it is to be granted that the self is a portion of the *Brahman*, so that the two statements mentioned above will not contradict each other.

This is not established by reasoning alone. The fact that the individual souls are part of the Brahman has been proved by the following scriptural texts and *Smṛti* passages :—

1. 'His one fourth part constitutes all the worlds' (*Puru. Sū.* 3-22).

2. 'In the word of life, the eternal soul is indeed a portion of mine' (*Bha. Gī.* XV-8).

The objection—a portion of an object means a part of a single unit. Therefore logically there is no possibility of any distinction between these two—is set aside in *Sūtra* 11. 3. 45.

The luminosity, the species, the attribute and the body belong to the fire, the substance, the attributed thing and the soul which are distinct from them. Yet they form a portion of the fire etc. In this way the individual souls

[1] वस्तुत्वेनाविरोधो A 2, M 1. विरोधः स्यात् M 2, 3.

प्रति प्रत्यगात्मनोऽंशत्वम् । एवमंशत्वे यत्स्वभावोंऽशभूतो जीवः, नैवमंशी परमात्मा; सर्वत्र विशेषणविशेष्ययोः स्वरूपस्वभावभेदात् । एवं च "कर्ता शास्त्रार्थवत्त्वात्" "परात्तु तच्छ्रुतेः" इत्यनन्तरोक्तं च न विरुध्यते ।

एवं प्रकाशशरीरवज्जीवात्मनामंशत्वं पराशरादयः स्मरन्ति—

"एकदेशस्थितस्याग्नेर्ज्योत्स्ना विस्तारिणी यथा ।
परस्य ब्रह्मणः शक्तिस्तथेयमखिलं जगत् ॥"
"यत्किंचित्सृज्यते येन सत्त्वजातेन वै द्विज ।
तस्य सृज्यस्य संभूतौ तत्सर्वं वै हरेस्तनुः" ॥
"ते सर्वे सर्वभूतस्य विष्णोरंशसमुद्भवाः ॥"

इति ।

become a portion of the *Brahman*, who has them as His body. The individual souls which are portions of the *Brahman*, have their own inherent characteristics; but the *Brahman*, of whom the individuals souls are portions, does not possess those characteristics because the things and their attributes are always found to be distinct from each other in regard to their natural state and inherent characteristics. Thus no contradiction arises in what is stated in *Sūtras* II-3-33 and 40. That the individual souls are portions of the *Brahman* in the same way as luminosity, etc. is stated by *Parāśara* and others—

(1) 'The fire remains in one place; but its light spreads all round. In this way, all the worlds are the manifestations of the power of the *Brahman*' (*Viṣṇu* I-22-56).

(2) 'Oh! twice-born one, which ever is created for its generation by an agent, it forms the body of *Hari*' (*Viṣṇu* I-22-38).

(3) 'All these are produced from a portion of *Viṣṇu* who appears as all beings' (*Viṣṇu* 1-22-20).

अन्यथा पारमार्थिकापारमार्थिकोपाधिसमाश्रयणेन प्रत्यगात्मनोऽंशत्वे ब्रह्मण एव वेदान्तनिवर्त्याः सर्वे दोषा भवेयुरिति "आभासा एव च" इत्यादिनोक्तम् ।

अतः सर्वदा चिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकतया तदात्मभूतमेव ब्रह्म । कदाचिदविभक्तनामरूपचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरं तत्कारणावस्थम्; कदाचिच्च विभक्तनामरूपचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरं तत्कार्यावस्थं ब्रह्म । सर्वदा चिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकतया तद्विशिष्टत्वेऽपि ब्रह्मणः परिणामित्वापुरुषार्थाश्रयत्वे शरीरभूतचेतनाचेतनवस्तुगते । आत्मभूतं ब्रह्म सर्वदा निरस्तनिखिलदोषगन्धानवधिकातिशयासंख्येयज्ञानानन्दाद्यपरिमितोदारगुणसागरमवतिष्ठत इति ब्रह्मैव जगन्निमित्त-

Otherwise, if it is viewed that the individual souls become a portion of the *Brahman* due to a certain limiting conditions, that are either of a true or of untrue nature all the faults, intended to be set aside by the Vedānta texts do attach themselves to the *Brahman*. This has been stated in *Sūtra* II-3-49. and so on.

Therefore, the *Brahman* has always as his body all the sentient and non-sentient beings and is the Self of all those beings. The *Brahman* is in the state of cause at that time, when His body constitutes the sentient and non-sentient beings without distinct names and froms. He is in the state of effect at that time, when His body constitutes the sentient and non-sentient beings with distinct names and forms. Though the sentient and the non-sentient beings are the body of the *Brahman*; yet the sentient and the non-sentient beings, who form the body of the *Brahman*, do undergo changes and are the seat of the evils. Even then, the *Brahman* who is the Self of these objects, is the ocean of auspicious qualities, such as knowledge, bliss, etc. which are innumerable, unsurpassable

मुपादानं चेति "यतो वा इमानि" इत्यादि वाक्यं प्रतिपादयत्येवेति जन्माद्यस्य यतस्तद् ब्रह्मेति सुष्ठूक्तम् ।

"सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत् । एकमेवाद्वितीयम् + तदैक्षत । बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इति । अस्य चायमर्थः—"यस्यात्मा शरीरम्" "यस्याक्षरं शरीरं यस्य पृथिवी शरीरं यस्याव्यक्तं शरीरम्, एष सर्वभूतान्तरात्मापहतपाप्मा दिव्यो देव एको नारायणः" इत्यादिश्रुतेर्ब्रह्मणः सर्वदा चिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकत्वात् सदेवेदमिदानीं स्थूलचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकत्वेन विभक्त-

in excellence and opposed to all evils. That *Brahman* is the efficient cause and the material cause of the world is established by the text, 'From whom all these beings are born' *Tait.* III-1-1). Thus this has been correctly stated—He is the *Brahman*, from whom proceed the creation, etc. of this universe.

Consider the scriptural text—'Existence alone, my dear boy, this word was in the beginning one only, without a second. It thought may I become many and be born' (*Chānd.* VI-2-1). The meaning of this text is this—That *Brahman* has always all the sentient and the non-sentient beings as the body has been proved by the following scriptural texts—

(1) 'He, whose body is the self' (*Mādh. Brāhmaṇa*).

(2) 'He, whose body is the indestructible one, He, whose body is the earth, He, whose hody is the *Avyakta*, He is the inner Self of all beings; He is devoid of sins, He is the Divine Lord, He is the One *Nārāyaṇa*' (*Sub.* VII-1).

Now the Existence, that has the sentient and non-sentient beings in a gross form as Its body, manifested Itself as having

नामरूपम्, अग्रे प्रलयकाले सूक्ष्मदशापन्नचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकतया नामरूप-विभागानर्हमेकमेवासीत्। स्वयमेव ब्रह्म सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्ति निमित्तान्तरानपेक्ष-मद्वितीयं चातिष्ठत्।

"तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इति। तन्नामरूपविभागानर्ह-सूक्ष्मचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकतयैकमेवावस्थितं नामरूपविभागार्हस्थूलदशापत्त्या बहुप्रकारं स्यामित्यैक्षत। स्यां, प्रजायेयेति व्यष्टिसमष्टिव्यपदेशः। चिदचितोः परस्य च प्रलयकालेऽपि व्यवहारानर्हसूक्ष्मभेदः सर्वैर्वेदान्ति-भिरभ्युपगतः, अविद्याकृतभेदस्योपाधिकृतभेदस्य चानादित्वाभ्युपगमात्।

a distinct name and form It in the beginning *i.e.* at the time of the deluge, remained only one having as Its body all the sentient and non-sentient beings in a subtle form, and did not manifest Itself as having a distinct name and form. The *Brahman* Himself who is omniscient and omnipotent, remained without a second, not requiring any other efficient cause.

The meaning of the scriptural text, 'It thought—May I become many and be born' (*Chānd* VI-2-1) is this—The Brahman remained only one having as His body, all the sentient and non-sentient beings, that had neither name nor form in their subtle state. It thought of becoming many by assuming a gross form, that has a distinct name and form. The words, 'May become' and 'Be born' indicate respectively the distributive and aggregate forms of creation. All *Vedāntins* accept this doctrine *viz*—At the time of deluge, the intelligent and the non-intelligent beings do assume a subtle and indescribable difference from the Highest Person. Other *Vedāntins* also accept the difference between them produced by ignorance or limiting conditions as beginningless. Here the peculiarity is this: In the other schools the *Brahman* becomes ignorant and is associated with limiting conditions. This is opposed

इयांस्तु विशेषः—ब्रह्मैवाज्ञमुपाधिसंबद्धं चेति सर्वश्रुतिस्मृतिन्यायविरोधोऽन्येषाम् । तदभावादविरोधश्चास्माकमिति ॥

शास्त्रयोनित्वाधिकरणम् ३

शास्त्रयोनित्वात् ॥ ३ ॥

एवं चिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकतया तद्विशिष्टस्य ब्रह्मण एव जगदुपादानत्वं निमित्तत्वं च नानुमानगम्यमिति शास्त्रैकप्रमाणकत्वात्तस्य "यतो वा इमानि भूतानि" इत्यादि वाक्यं निखिलजगदेककारणं ब्रह्म बोधयत्येवेति सिद्धम् ॥

to what is stated in all scriptural and *Smṛti* texts and reasoning. There will be no such opposition in our school, as all these (*i.e.* ignorance and limiting conditions) are not recognised.

S'ĀSTRAYONITVĀDHIKARAṆA 3

3. *Sāstrayonitvāt.*

(That the *Brahman* is the cause of the creation etc. follows altogether from the scripture), because the scripture alone forms the source (of the knowledge related to Him).

The *Brahman*, who has as His body all the sentient and non-sentient beings, is the material cause and also the efficient cause of the Universe. This fact could not be apprehended by reasoning; but could be proved by scriptures alone. Therefore it is established that the scriptural text 'From whom, all these things are born (*Tait.* III. 1) discerns the *Brahman*, who is the only cause of all the worlds.

समन्वयाधिकरणम् ४

तत्तु समन्वयात् ॥ ४ ॥

पुरुषार्थतयान्वयः समन्वयः। शास्त्राख्यप्रमाणस्य पुरुषार्थपर्यवसायित्वेऽपि, ब्रह्म स्वस्य परस्य चानुभवितुरविशेषेण स्वरूपेण गुणैर्विभूत्या चानुभूयमानमनवधिकातिशयानन्दरूपमिति पुरुषार्थत्वेनाभिधेयतयान्वयात् ब्रह्मणः शास्त्रप्रमाणकत्वमुपपन्नतरमिति निरवद्यम् ॥

ईक्षत्यधिकरणम् ५

निखिलजगदेककारणं ब्रह्म वेदान्ताः प्रतिपादयन्तीत्युक्तम्। तस्यैकस्यैकदैव कृत्स्नजगन्निमित्तत्वं तस्यैवोपादानतया जगदात्मकत्वं च नानुमानादि-

SAMANVAYĀDHIKARANA 4

4. *Tattu samanvayāt.*

That (*viz.* the fact that the scriptures form altogether the source of the knowledge relating to the *Brahman*) results, however, from (His constituting) the true purport (of the scripture).

His constituting the true purport of the scripture is the same as His being the object of human pursuit. Though the function of the proof, known as scripture, ends in determining the object of human pursuit, Yet the Brahman, who is experienced equally by Himself and others in His natural state, in His peculiar characteristics and in His great splendour, is of unsurpassed bliss and this is intended to be denoted by the *S'āstra*. Therefore it is quite right that *Brahman* could be proved by the *S'āstra*. Thus there is no any defect.

ĪKṢATYADHIKARAṆA 5

It has been previously stated that the *Vedāntas* establish the *Brahman*, as the sole cause of the entire universe. He

गम्यमिति शास्त्रैकप्रमाणकत्वात्, तस्य चानवधिकातिशयानन्दरूपतया परमपुरुषार्थत्वाद्वेदान्ताः प्रतिपादयन्त्येवेति स्थिरीकृतम्। अतः परं पादशेषेण जगत्कारणतया प्रधानपुरुषप्रतिपादनानर्हतया सर्वज्ञं सत्यसंकल्पं निरस्ताऽविद्यादिसमस्तदोषगन्धमपरिमितोदारगुणसागरं ब्रह्मैव वेदान्ताः प्रतिपादयन्तीत्युच्यते। तत्र तावत् प्रधानं वेदान्तप्रतिपादनानर्हमित्याह--

ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम् ॥ ५ ॥

alone is the efficient cause of the entire universe At the same time He is in the form of the universe, as He is its material cause also. This fact has to be determined by the *Sāstras* only as the inferential reasoning is incapable of proving it. He is the highest object of human pursuit; because His essential characteristic constitutes the unsurpassable bliss. Therefore the *Vedāntas* surely teach about Him. This fact has been firmly established before. Then in the rest of this Pāda it is stated that as the *Prakṛti* and the individual selves are not fit to be mentioned as the cause of the world. The *Vedāntas* teach about the *Brahman* only, who is omniscient, who possesses a true will, who is hostile to all evils such as ignorance etc. and who is the ocean of innumerable noble qualities.

Of these, the author first states that the *Prakṛti* could not be mentioned in the *Vedānta* as the cause of the world.

5. *Īkṣaternāsabdam.*

Because the predicative root, *Īkṣ* is used (in connection with the activity of what constitutes the cause of the world) that which is not in the scope of the scripture alone (*viz.* the *Pradhāna* or *Prakṛti,*) is not (referred to in the scriptural passage relating to the cause of the world).

अशब्दम्=आनुमानिकं=प्रधानम् । न तत् वेदान्तवेद्यम् । कुतः ? ईक्षतेः । "सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्" इति प्रस्तुतजगत्कारण-व्यापारवाचिन ईक्षतेर्धातोः श्रवणात् "तदैक्षत बहु स्याम्" इति ॥

गौणश्चेन्नात्मशब्दात् ॥ ६ ॥

"तत्तेज ऐक्षत" इत्याद्यचेतनेऽपि वस्तुनीक्षतिः श्रूयते । स हि तत्र गौणः । एवमत्रापि प्रधान एवेक्षतिर्गौण इति चेत्; नैतदुपपद्यते, प्रस्तुते

That which is not capable of being revealed by the scripture alone, is meant here by the term *As'abda i.e. Anumānika* that which is established by the process of logical inference, *i.e.* the *Pradhāna.* The meaning is that the *Pradhāna,* is not apprehended by the *Vedānta.* Why ? Because the root *Īks* (to see, *i.e.* to think) is used. That is because the root, *Īks* is used in the scriptural passage 'It thought *May I become manifold and be born*' (*Chānd.* VI-2-3) to denote the activity of the universal cause; closely related to what is stated in the text, 'Existence alone, my dear boy, was in the beginning, one only without a second' (*Chānd.* VI-2-1).

6. *Gauṇas'cennātmas'abdāt.*

If it be said that it (*viz.* the root *Īkṣ*), is used here in a figurative sense, it cannot be so; because there is the word *Ātman* (mentioned in the context).

In the scriptural statement 'That fire thought' (*Chānd.* VI-2-3) the root *Īkṣ* is used in conection with the action of the non-intelligent substance also. The root apparently is there used in a figurative sense. Likewise in the case of the *Pradhāna* also, the root *Īkṣ* is used in a figurative

सच्छब्दवाच्ये श्रूयमाणाच्चेतनवाचिन आत्मशब्दात्। "स आत्मा, तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो" इति ह्युत्तरत्र श्रूयते।

तेजःप्रभृतिष्वपि न गौणमीक्षणम्। तेजःप्रभृतिशब्दैरपि तत्तच्छरीरकं ब्रह्मैवाभिधीयते, "अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि" इति ब्रह्मात्मकजीवानुप्रवेशादेव सर्वस्य वस्तुनो नामरूपभाक्त्वात्। "तत्सृष्ट्वा। तदेवानुप्राविशत्। तदनुप्रविश्य। सच्च त्यच्चाभवत्। निरुक्तं चानिरुक्तं च। निलयनं चानिलयनं च। विज्ञानं चाविज्ञानं च। सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यमभवत्" इति चेतनमचेतनं च पृथङ् निर्दिश्य तदुभयमनु-

sense. This is not intelligible; because in the context of the import of the word *Sat*, the word *Ātman* denoting the intelligent one is used. In the subsequent portion there is the passage—'He is the Self.' That thou art, Oh! 'S'vetaketu' (*Chānd*. VI-8-7).

In fact as regards fire etc. also the power of seeing is not to be explained in a figurative sense, because the words fire etc. denote the *Brahman* only who has them as His body. All these objects are distinguishable as having a name and form; because *the Brahman* has entered them, through the individual souls which constitute His body. It is because there is the statement, 'Indeed entering in the form of the individual self, I evolve the differentiation of names and forms' (*Chānd*. VI-3-2). The intelligent and the non-intelligent substances are separately stated in the text 'Having created it, He entered the same; Having entered it, He became *Sat* and *Tyat* (intelligent and non-intelligent), describable and not describable, the support and supported, the animate and inanimate, the truth and untruth. Yet he remained truth' (*Tait*. II-6). Having entered the both, He became that and that *i.e.* He

प्रविश्य तत्तद्भवत् तत्तच्छब्दवाच्योऽभवदिति हि समानप्रकरणे स्पष्टमभिहितम् ॥

तन्निष्ठस्य मोक्षोपदेशात् ॥ ७ ॥

इतश्च प्रधानादर्थान्तरभूतं[1] सच्छब्दाभिहितं जगत्कारणम्, सच्छब्दाभिहिततत्त्वनिष्ठस्य मोक्षोपदेशात्। "तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये" इति हि तन्निष्ठस्य मोक्ष उपदिश्यते। प्रधानकारणवादिनामपि[2] हि प्रधाननिष्ठस्य मोक्षो नाभिमतः[3] ॥

became the meaning of the words denoting that and that. Thus the fact has been clearly stated in the same context.

7. *Tanniṣṭhasya mokṣopadeśāt.*

Because it is taught that he, who is firmly devoted to that (*viz.* the *Sat*) obtains final release.

By the following reason also, the cause of the world mentioned by the term *Sat* is other than the *Pradhāna* or *Prakṛti.* It is taught in the context that he, who is firmly devoted to the Truth meant by the term *Sat* obtains final release. It is taught in the scriptural text, 'For him so long there is delay, as long as he is not freed from the body; then he will reach the *Brahman.* (*Chānd.* VI-14-2) that he, who is firmly devoted to Him, obtains final release. Consider the school that accepts *Pradhāna* to be the cause of the creation etc. of the world. Even they belonging to that school do not accept the fact,—that he, who is firmly devoted to *Pradhāna*, obtains final release.

[1] अर्थान्तरं A 1, M 2, M 4.
[2] वादिनापि M 1, 2.
[3] नाभिहितः M 1, 2.

हेयत्वावचनाच्च ॥ ८ ॥

यदि प्रधानमत्र विवक्षितं, तदा तस्य हेयत्वम्[1] अध्येयत्वमुच्येत। न तदुच्यते। मोक्षसाधनतया ध्येयत्वमेव ह्यत्रोच्यते "तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो" इत्यादिना ॥

प्रतिज्ञाविरोधात् ॥ ९ ॥

इतश्च न प्रधानम्, एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानप्रतिज्ञाविरोधात्। सच्छब्दवाच्यतत्त्वज्ञानेन तत्कार्यतया चेतनाचेतनसर्ववस्तुज्ञानं "येनाश्रुतं

8. *Heyatvāvacanācca.*

Because also it is not declared that it (*viz.* what is denoted by the word *sat* or existence) deserves to be discarded.

If the *Pradhāna* were meant as the cause of the creation etc. then it would have been taught that what is denoted by the word *Sat* or existence deserves to be discarded. This has not been done. In the passage 'That thou art, Oh! *S'vetaketu* (*Chānd.* VI-8-7) it is stated that he should be firmly devoted to that *viz.*, *Sat*, as the means of final release.

9. *Pratijnāvirodhāt.*

Because also there would then be the contradiction of the proposition (enunciated in the context).

From the following reason also the *Pradhāna* is not the cause of the creation etc; because it contradicts the proposition of cognition of all things from the cognition of a single thing. From the scriptural text, 'From which the

[1] हेयत्वात् M 2, 4.

श्रुतं भवति" इत्यादिना प्रतिज्ञातम्। तद्धि प्रधानकारणवादे विरुध्यते, चेतनस्य प्रधानकार्यत्वाभावात्। प्रधानादर्थान्तरभूतब्रह्मकारणवादे चिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकं ब्रह्मैव नामरूपविभागाविभागाभ्यां[1] कार्यं कारणं चेति ब्रह्मज्ञानेन कृत्स्नस्य ज्ञाततोपपद्यते ॥

स्वाप्ययात् ॥ १० ॥

इतश्च न प्रधानम्। "स्वप्नान्तं मे सोम्य विजानीहीति। यत्रै-

unheard becomes heard, etc.' (*Chānd.* VI-1-3) arises the proposition that the knowledge of that entity, which is denoted by the word *Sat,* produces the knowledge of all the sentient and non-sentient beings as they are its effect. Then there is contradiction in the school that accepts the *Pradhāna* as the cause of the world; because *Pradhāna* cannot produce the sentient being. Consider the school that accepts *Brahman,* who is different from the *Pradhāna,* to be the cause of the world. Then the *Brahman,* having as his body all the sentient and non-sentient beings, with distinct names and forms is the effect and without distinct names and forms is the cause. Hence it is correct to say that by the knowledge of the *Brahman* the knowledge of everything is produced.

10. *Svāpyayāt.*

Because also, there is (mentioned in the context) the withdrawal (of the individual soul) into its own Self.

By the following reason also the *Pradhāna* is not the cause of the creation etc. of the world. The scriptural passage—'Know from me, my dear boy, what deep sleep

[1] विभागभावाभावाभ्यां A 1, M 4.

तत्पुरुषः स्वपिति नाम सता सोम्य तदा संपन्नो भवति। स्वमपीतो भवति। तस्मादेनं स्वपितीत्याचक्षते। स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति" इति जीवस्य[1] चेतनस्य सुषुप्तस्य सता संपन्नस्य स्वाप्ययवचनात् प्रधानादर्थान्तरभूतं सच्छब्दवाच्यमिति विज्ञायते। स्वमपीतो भवति; आत्मानमेव जीवोऽपीतो भवतीत्यर्थः।

चिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकं तदात्मभूतं ब्रह्मैव जीवशब्देनाप्यभिधीयत इति नामरूपव्याकरणश्रुत्योक्तम्। तज्जीवशब्दाभिधेयं परं ब्रह्मैव सुषुप्तिकालेऽपि प्रलयकाल इव नामरूपपरिष्वङ्गाभावात् केवलसच्छब्दाभिधेयमिति 'सता सोम्य तदा संपन्नो भवति। स्वमपीतो भवति' इत्युच्यते।

is, when any person is known to be asleep, he is then in union with the *Sat*. He withdraws into his Self. Therefore they say, he sleeps; because he is absorbed into His Self (*i.e.* into the *Brahman*)' (*Chānd.* VI-8-1)—declares that the individual self, who is asleep and is in union with the *Sat*, has withdrawn himself to his Self. Hence it is known that what is denoted by the word *Sat*, is an object other than the *Pradhāna*. The expression, 'Has withdrawn himself to his Self' means becomes merged or absorbed into his Self.

It is declared in the scriptural passage relating to the differentiation of names and forms, that the *Brahman* Himself, who has the intelligent and non-intellegent beings for His body and forms their selves, is denoted by the word self which ordinarily means the individual self. By means of the statement, 'He is then in union with the *Sat*; He withdraws into his Self' (*Chānd.* VI-8-1), it is taught that the *Brahman*, who is denoted by the word mentioning *jīva*, is free from any association with names and forms at the time of deep sleep also, as He is at the time of universal

[1] जीवस्य omitted A 1.

तथा समानप्रकरणे नामरूपपरिष्वङ्गाभावेन प्राज्ञेनैव परिष्वङ्गात् "प्राज्ञेनात्मना संपरिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किंचन वेद नान्तरम्" इत्युच्यते। आ मोक्षाज्जीवस्य नामरूपपरिष्वङ्गादेव हि स्वव्यतिरिक्तविषयज्ञानोदयः। सुषुप्तिकाले हि नामरूपे विहाय सता संपरिष्वक्तः पुनरपि जागरदशायां नामरूपे परिष्वज्य तत्तन्नामरूपो भवतीति श्रुत्यन्तरे स्पष्टमभिधीयते। यथा "सुप्तः स्वप्नं न [1]कंचन पश्यति, अथास्मिन् प्राण एवैकधा भवति।"

dissolution and He is hence to be denoted merely by the word *Sat* or Existence

To the same effect, it is stated in a similar context elsewhere that, owing to his (*i.e.* the individual self) not being associated with names and forms, he is embraced by Him who is omniscient; and consequently it is said that, 'when he is embraced by the omniscient Self, he does not know anything that is external or internal' (*Bṛh.* IV-3-21). Indeed till his final release the individual soul is associated with names and forms; and it is, therefore, there is born in him the knowledge of objects other than himself. At the time of deep sleep he certainly gives up names and forms, and is embraced by the *Sat* (*i.e.* by the *Brahman*), and again in waking state, he becomes associated with names and forms and becomes possessed with various names and forms. This is clearly stated in other scriptural passages, *namely*, 'When he (*i.e.* the individual self) is deeply asleep, he sees no dreams whatsoever, and he becomes one wholly with the *Prāna* (*Brahman*).' (*Kauṣ.* II. 30). 'From that Self, the *Prānās* (*i.e.* Jīvas) proceed towards their own places' (*Kaus.* II-34). To the same effect is the

[1] कथंचन M 24.

"एतस्माद्वा आत्मनः प्राणा [1]यथायतनं विप्रतिष्ठन्ते"। तथा "त इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा+यद्यद्भवन्ति तदा भवन्ति" इति॥

गतिसामान्यात्॥ ११॥

सकलोपनिषद्गतिसामान्यादस्यामप्युपनिषदि न प्रधानं कारणमिति ज्ञायते। "आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्। नान्यत्किंचन मिषत्। स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति। स इमान् लोकानसृजत" "तस्माद्वा

following scriptural passage also—'To whatever state these beings belonged before the deep sleep, *namely* of a tiger, or a lion, or a wolf, or a boar etc. they come again to that state when they wake' (*Chānd.* VI-9-3).

11. *Gatisāmānyāt.*

Because there has to be similarity of import (between the passage under reference and the other passages relating to the case of the creation etc. of the world).

There has to be similarity of import among all other Upanishadic passages and the upanishadic passage under reference. Hence it is known that the *Pradhāna* is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world. In all the scriptural passages stated below, the Lord of all is made out to be the cause of the world—

(1) 'The Self, indeed, this one only was in the beginning. Nothing else lived. He thought, *May I create the worlds.* He created these worlds' (*Ait.* I-1).

[1] यथायथं A 1.

एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः" "स कारणं करणाधिपाधिपो न चास्य कश्चिज्जनिता न चाधिपः" इत्यादिसकलोपनिषत्सु सर्वेश्वर एव हि सर्वजगत्कारणमिति प्रतिपाद्यते ॥

श्रुतत्वाच्च ॥ १२ ॥

श्रुतमेव ह्यस्यामुपनिषदि " आत्मनः[1] प्राणः + आत्मन[1] आकाशः" इत्यादावात्मन एव सर्वोत्पत्तिः । अतः प्रधानादचेतनादर्थान्तरभूतः सर्वज्ञः पुरुषोत्तम एव जगत्कारणं ब्रह्मेति स्थितम् ॥

(2) 'From that same Self, the spatial ether came into existence' (*Tait.* II-1-1).

(3) 'He is the cause. He is the Lord of the lord of the senses. He has neither progenitor nor superior' (*S've.* VI-9).

12. *S'rutatvācca*

Because also it is revealed (in the very Upaniṣad in which the passage under discussion occurs, and in other Upaniṣads, that the Supreme Self is the cause of the universe).

Indeed, in this *Upaniṣad* (*viz.* the *Chāndogya*) in the following passages, 'From the Self the *Prāṇa* came into existence etc, and from the Self, the spatial ether came into existence (*chānd* VII-26-1)' it is stated that all are produced from the Self only. Therefore that the cause of the universe is the *Brahman* who is all-knowing Highest person and distinct from the inanimate *Pradhāna*, stands firmly.

[1] आत्मन इत्येवाम्नत्येषु सर्वेषु तालपत्रकोशेषु पाठः। मुद्रितकोशपाठस्तु आत्मत इति।

आनन्दमयाधिकरणम् ६

आनन्दमयोऽभ्यासात् ॥ १३ ॥

यद्यपि प्रधानादर्थान्तरभूतस्य प्रत्यगात्मनश्चेतनस्येक्षणयोगः संभवति, तथापि प्रत्यगात्मा बद्धो मुक्तश्च न जगत्कारणम्, "तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः" इत्यारभ्य "तस्माद्वा एतस्माद्विज्ञानमयात्। अन्योऽन्तर आत्मानन्दमयः" [1]इति तस्यानन्दमयत्वप्रतिपादनात्। कारणतया व्यपदिष्टोऽयमानन्दमयः[2] प्रत्यगात्मनोऽर्थान्तरभूतः सर्वज्ञः परमात्मैव।

ĀNANDAMAYĀDHIKARAṆA 6

13. *Ānandamayobhyāsāt*

That, which is denoted by the term *Ānandamaya* (is the *Brahman*); because there is (in the context), the repetition of various grades (of bliss which culminate in the *Ānandamaya* or the Highest Bliss).

No doubt the individual self, that possesses intelligence and that is different from the *Pradhāna*, has the power of seeing; yet the individual self, neither in the state of bondage nor in the state of final release, can be the cause of the universe. The scriptural text beginning with 'From the same self, the spatial ether came into existence' and ending with 'Different from this *Vijñānamaya*,[3] is the Inner-Self *Ānandamaya*[4]' (*Tait.* II-1-1) declares that the *Ānandamaya* mentioned as the cause of the universe, is the all-knowing Highest

[1] इत्यस्य A 1, M 2. [2] अयमात्मानन्दमयः M 1, M 2.

[3] *Vijñānamaya* is the individual soul whose essential characteristic is knowledge

[4] *Ānandamaya* is the *Brahman* whose essential characteristic is the abundant bliss,

कुतः ? अभ्यासात् । आनन्दमयस्य निरतिशयदशाशिरस्कानन्दमयत्वेनाभ्यासात् । "ते ये शतं प्रजापतेरानन्दाः । स एको ब्रह्मण आनन्दः" "यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते । अप्राप्य मनसा सह । आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् । न बिभेति कुतश्चन" इति हि [1]वेद्यत्वेनायमानन्दमयोऽनवधिकातिशयोऽभ्यस्यते ॥

विकारशब्दान्नेति चेन्न प्राचुर्यात् ॥ १४ ॥

"स वा एष पुरुषोऽन्नरसमयः" इति विकारार्थमयट्प्रकरणा-

Self, who is other than the individual soul. Why? Because of the repetition. Because there is repetition of the bliss in various grades which culminates in the *Ānandamaya* and which (bliss) forms the summits of unsurpassable condition. This *Ānandamaya* of the unsurpassable condition is repeatedly mentioned in the text, for meditation 'The hundredfold of the bliss of *Prajāpati* is equal to the single bliss of the *Brahman* (*Tait.* II-8-4), 'Wherefrom speeches together with the mind return not having reached it. He who knows the Brahman's bliss fears not from anything' (*Tait.* II-3-8).

14. *Vikāraśabdānneti cenna prācuryāt*

It may be said that owing to there being the affix (*Maya*) significant of modification, (the *Ānandamaya* is) not (the Brahman); but it is not (right to say) so because that (affix *Maya*) signifies abundance.

The affix *Mayat* means modification in the context 'That this person is *Annarasamaya* (*i.e.* the modification of

[1] वेद्यत्वेनायमात्मा A 2, M 1.

दानन्दमय इत्यस्यापि विकारार्थत्वं प्रतीयते । अतोऽयमानन्दमयो नाविकाररूपः परमात्मेति चेन्न, अर्थविरोधात् प्राचुर्यार्थे एवायं मयडिति विज्ञायते । "तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः" इति[1] ह्यविकार आत्मा प्रकृतः । प्रकरणे च विकारार्थत्वं प्राणमय एव परित्यक्तम् । [2]उक्तेन न्यायेनानन्दप्राचुर्यात् परमपुरुष एवायमानन्दमयः ॥

तद्धेतुव्यपदेशाच्च ॥ १५ ॥

"एष ह्येवानन्दयाति" इति जीवान्प्रत्यानन्दहेतुरयमानन्दमयो व्यपदिश्यते । अतश्चायं न प्रत्यगात्मा ॥

the essence of food)' (*Tait.* II-1-3). Therefore, the term *Ānandamaya* also means the modification of bliss. Hence *Ānandamaya* is not the Highest Self, that does not undergo modification. It is not so. Because there is contradiction of the purport, the affix *Mayaṭ* is understood to mean here 'abundance'. The scriptural text 'From that very same Self, the spatial ether came into existence' (*Tait.* II-1-1) refers to the Self, that does not undergo modification. The notion that the affix *Mayaṭ* denotes modification, has been given up already in the case of *Prāṇamaya*. Following this argument, it should be accepted that the *Ānandamaya* is only the Highest person; because there is an abundance of bliss in Him.

15. *Taddhetuvyapadeśācca*

Because also this *Ānandamaya* is declared (in the contex) to be the cause of that (which forms the bliss of the individual selves).

'For, He Himself causes the bliss' (*Tait.* II-7-1). In this passage it is declared that *Ānandamaya* causes the bliss of

[1] इत्यविकार A 1. [2] उक्तन्यायेन A 1, M 1.

मान्त्रवर्णिकमेव च गीयते ॥ १६ ॥

"सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म" इति मन्त्रवर्णोदितमेव "तस्माद्वा एतस्मात्" इत्यादिनानन्दमय इति गीयते । अतश्च न प्रत्यगात्मा ॥

नेतरोऽनुपपत्तेः ॥ १७ ॥

इतरः प्रत्यगात्मा मन्त्रवर्णोदित इति नाशङ्कनीयम्, "सोऽश्नुते

the individual selves Therefore the *Ānandamaya* is not the individual self.

16. *Māntravarṇikameva ca gīyate*

Because also that the same Being, who is denoted by the words of the *Mantra* (in the context), is declared (as the *Ānandamaya*).

That same *Brahman*, who is described by the words of the *Mantra*, 'The *Brahman* is Reality, Knowledge, Infinity' is spoken of as the *Ānandamaya* in the passage 'Verily from this' (*Tait.* II-1-1). Hence the *Ānandamaya* is not the individual self.

17. *Netaronupapatteḥ*

He, who is other (than the *Brahman*) is not (that Being, who is described by the words of the *Mantra*) because (in such a case) there would be inappropriateness.

It should not be doubted that the other (individual self) is denoted by the words of the *Mantra*. The individual self, either in his state of bondage or in the state of final release, cannot

सर्वान् कामान् सह । ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता" इति प्रत्यगात्मनो बद्धस्य मुक्तस्य चेदृशविपश्चित्त्वानुपपत्तेः । "सोऽकामयत । बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इति विचित्रस्थिरत्रसरूपबहुभवनसंकल्परूपमिदं विपश्चित्त्वमिति ह्युत्तरत्र व्यज्यते । मुक्तस्य सर्वज्ञस्यापि जगद्व्यापाराभावादीदृशविपश्चित्त्वासंभवः ॥

इतश्च—

भेदव्यपदेशाच्च ॥ १८ ॥

"तस्माद्वा एतस्माद्विज्ञानमयात् । अन्योऽन्तर आत्मानन्दमयः" इति हि विज्ञानमयात् प्रत्यगात्मनो भेदेनायमानन्दमयो व्यपदिश्यते ।

have such *Vipascittva* or extraordinary intellect mentioned in the scriptural text, ' He enjoys all desires and the intelligent *Brahman* (*Tait.* II-1-2) It is stated in the subsequent text, ' It thought, may I become many ' (*Chānd.* VI-2-1 & 3), that the intelligence (*Vipascittva*) is only in the form of the will of the lord in assuming many forms of wonderful things including movable and immovable beings. Though the liberated soul, is all-knowing, yet he cannot create the world. Hence he cannot have such *Vipascittva* (intelligence) of the type stated above.

18. *Bhedavyapadesācca*

Because also there is (in the context) the declaration of difference (between the individual self and the *Brahman*).

That the *Ānandamaya* is distinct from the individual soul known as *Vijñānamaya* is declared in the Scriptural text, ' Different from this *Vijñānamaya* (the individual soul) is this Inner-self, the *Ānandamaya* (*Tait.* II-5). It should not

न च विज्ञानमयविषयतयोदाहृते श्लोके "विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते" इति व्यपदेशात् विज्ञानमयो बुद्धिमात्रमित्याशङ्कनीयम्। यतः सूत्रकार एवेमामाशङ्कां परिहरिष्यति—"व्यपदेशाच्च क्रियायां न चेन्निर्देशविपर्ययः" इति। "विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते" इति यज्ञादिक्रियायां जीवस्य कर्तृत्वव्यपदेशाच्च जीवः कर्ता, विज्ञानशब्देन जीवस्य व्यपदेशात्। बुद्धिमात्रव्यपदेशे तु विज्ञानेनेति निर्देशविपर्ययः स्यात्, बुद्धेः करणत्वादिति॥

इतश्च—

कामाच्च नानुमानापेक्षा ॥ १९ ॥

"सोऽकामयत। बहु स्याम्" इति स्वकामादेवास्य [1]जगत्सर्गः

be doubted that the term *Vijñānamaya* means mere intellect on the ground that the *Vijñānamaya* is mentioned as mere intellect in the text '*Vijñāna* (intellect) performs the sacrifice' (*Tait.* II-5-1). The *Sūtrakāra* himself will clear this doubt in *Sūtra* II-3-35. In the scriptural text 'The intellect performs the sacrifice (*Tait.* II-5-1), the word intellect denotes the individual self who is the agent of the sacrifice. If the word, *Vijñāna* means intellect alone and not the individual self, then the reading of the text would be in a different way; because intellect is only an instrument of action.

19. *Kāmācca nānumānāpekṣā*

Because also His will (is in itself the cause of creation) the *Pradhāna* is not needed (by Him in the act of creation).

That the creation of the world is effected by His will alone is stated in the scriptural statement, 'He desired may I

[1] जगतः A 2, M 1.

श्रूयते । प्रत्यगात्मनो हि यस्य कस्यचित्सर्गे आनुमानापेक्षा दृश्यते । अनुमानगम्यं [1]प्रधानमानुमानम् ॥

इतश्च—

अस्मिन्नस्य च तद्योगं शास्ति ॥ २० ॥

अस्मिन् आनन्दमये अस्य प्रत्यगात्मन आनन्दयोगं शास्ति "रसो वै सः । रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वानन्दी भवति" इति । अतः प्रत्यगात्मनोऽर्थान्तरभूतः सर्वज्ञः पुरुषोत्तमो जगत्कारणभूत आनन्दमयः ॥

become manifold and be born' (*Tait.* II-6-1). It is seen that the individual soul requires the *Pradhāna* for the production of something. The *Pradhāna* is *Ānumāna* because it is proved by the inferential reasoning.

20. *Asminnasya ca tadyogaṁ śāsti*

Because also the scripture declares that the individual self's acquisition of the bliss takes place when he is in association with this (*Ānandamaya*).

The scriptural text declares that this individual soul gets bliss on reaching Him. The scriptural text is this 'Bliss, indeed, is He. Having obtained that very same Bliss, he (*i.e.* the individual self) becomes blissful (*Tait.* II-7-1). Therefore *Ānandamaya* is the all-knowing Highest Person, who is the cause of the world and who is other than the individual self.

[1] आनुमानं प्रधानम् M 1.

अन्तरधिकरणम् ७

अन्तस्तद्धर्मोपदेशात् ॥ २१ ॥

अयं जगत्कारणभूतो विपश्चिदानन्दमयः कश्चिदुपचितपुण्यविशेषो जीवविशेषो देहयोगाद्विज्ञायते; नायं परमात्मेति नाशङ्कनीयम्। "य एषोऽन्तरादित्ये हिरण्मयः पुरुषः" इत्यादौ श्रूयमाणः पुरुषः परमपुरुषः परमात्मैव। कुतः? तद्धर्मोपदेशात्। "स एष सर्वेषां लोकानामीशः सर्वेषां कामानाम्" "तस्योदिति नाम। स एष सर्वेभ्यः पाप्मभ्य उदितः" इति

ANTARADHIKARANA 7

21. *Antastaddharmopadeśāt*

He, who is within the sun and the eye is the *Brahman*, because His attributes are declared in the context.

It should not be doubted that the *Ānandamaya*, who is the cause of the world, omniscient and blissful is understood to be an individual self endowed with extraordinary merits and not the Supreme Self, because he is said to have a body. It refers to the Supreme Person and the Highest Self, that is denoted by the word, Person, occurring in the scriptural statement 'The Person, who is seen within the sun, He is brilliant like gold etc.' (*Chānd.* I-6-6). Why? Because His attributes are declared in the context. The attributes of the Highest Person, who is other than the individual self, are (*a*) His unlimited Lordship over all the worlds and all the desires (*b*) His not being under the influence cf Karman. The scriptural authorities are—' He is the lord of all the worlds

निरुपाधिकसर्वलोकसर्वकामेशत्वं स्वत एवाकर्मवश्यत्वं च प्रत्यगात्मनोऽर्थान्तरभूतस्य [1]परमपुरुषस्यैव हि धर्मः ।

"वेदाहमेतं पुरुषं महान्तम् । आदित्यवर्णं तमसः परस्तात्" इत्यादिषु त्रिगुणात्मकप्रकृत्यनन्तर्गताप्राकृतस्वासाधारणरूपवत्त्वं च ज्ञानादिगुणवत्तस्यैव हि श्रूयते । ज्ञानादयोऽपि "सत्यं ज्ञानम्" "यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्" "परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च" इत्यादिषु श्रुतत्वात् तस्य गुणा विज्ञायन्ते । तथा "आदित्यवर्णं तमसः परस्तात्" इत्यादिष्वप्राकृतस्वासाधारणरूपश्रवणात् तद्वत्ता च विज्ञायते ।

and also of all desires' 'His name is 'High'. This same person is risen above all sins' (*Chānd.* I-6-7).

The scriptural text, 'I know this Great Person of sun-like lustre, who is altogether beyond darkness' (*Tait. Ār.* III-13-1) states that He has an immaterial form, that is peculiar to Him and that could not be included among the modifications of the *Prakṛti* of *Triguna* (*i e. Sattva*, *Rajas*, and *Tamas*) in the same way as the quality of knowledge. That knowledge, etc. are His attributes is clearly seen in the scriptural texts— (1) 'The Brahman is the Reality, Knowledge' (*Tait.* II-1-1). (2) 'He, who knows all and understands all' (*Muṇḍ.* I-1-9). (3) 'His supreme power is declared, as varied and natural as well as His activity with knowledge and strength,' (*S'vet.* VI-8). That He has a divine form peculiar to Himself has been stated in the scriptural text, 'He is of sun-like lustre and altogether beyond darkness' (*Tait. Ār.* III-13-1). Hence He is known to be of that form.

[1] परमात्मन एव संभवति M 1, M 3. परमात्मन एव धर्मः A 2.

तदेतद्वाक्यकारश्चाह—"हिरण्मयः पुरुषो दृश्यत इति प्राज्ञः सर्वान्तरः स्यात्, लोककामेशोपदेशात् तथोदयात्पाप्मनाम्" इत्युक्त्वा, तद्रूपस्य कार्यत्वं मायामयत्वं वेति "स्यात्तद्रूपं कृतकमनुग्रहार्थं तच्चेतसामैश्वर्यात्" इति निरसनीयं मतमुपन्यस्य, "रूपं वातीन्द्रियमन्तःकरणप्रत्यक्षनिर्देशात्" इति। व्याख्यातं च द्रमिडाचार्यैः—"न वा मायामात्रम्। अञ्जसैव विश्वसृजो रूपम्। तत्तु न चक्षुषा ग्राह्यम्। मनसा त्वकल्मषेण साधनान्तरवता गृह्यते। 'न चक्षुषा गृह्यते नापि वाचा' 'मनसा तु विशुद्धेन' इति श्रुतेः। न ह्यरूपाया देवताया रूपमुपदिश्यते।

The Vākyakāra[1] also states thus—'The passage 'The Golden Person is beheld' (*Chānd.* I-6-6) refers to the Wise and Inner One, because He is described as the Lord of the world and the Lord of desires and also as raised high above evils'. Then in the next sentence 'His form is artificial and is assumed to bless His devotees because He displays His sovereign power' he (the Vākyakāra) introduces for refutation the view that His form must be a phase of effect or it must be illusory. Then (he himself) replies thus—'His form is indeed beyond the reach of the sense-organs; because it is mentioned to be perceived by *Antaḥkaraṇa* (or inner sense.' *Dramiḍācārya* has commented upon it thus—'The form of the creator of the universe is not illusory; it is real and natural. It cannot be apprehended by the eye; but could be apprehended through the mind, which must be free from impurity, by one, who has resorted to a different means of attaining Him'. The scriptural text is this—'He is not apprehended by the eye, nor by speech', 'but can be known only by a pure mind' (*Muṇḍa.* III-1-8). It is not taught that gods, who have no real form, have a form; because the

[1]The author of the Vākya, an explanatory treatise on the *Chāndogyopaniṣad*, is *Brahmanandin alias* Tanka.

यथाभूतवादि हि शास्त्रम्। 'माहारजनं वासः' 'वेदाहमेतं पुरुषं महान्तम्। आदित्यवर्णम्' इति प्रकरणान्तरनिर्देशाच्च साक्षिणः" इति। "हिरण्मय इति रूपसामान्याच्चन्द्रमुखवत्" इति च वाक्यम्। तच्च व्याख्यातं तैरेव—"न मयडत्र विकारमादाय प्रयुज्यते, अनारभ्यत्वादात्मनः" इत्यादिना। अतः प्रधानात् प्रत्यगात्मनश्चार्थान्तरभूतो निरुपाधिकविपश्चिदनवधिकातिशयानन्दोऽप्राकृतस्वासाधारणदिव्यरूपः पुरुषोत्तमः परं ब्रह्म जगत्कारणमिति वेदान्तैः प्रतिपाद्यत इति निरवद्यम्॥

भेदव्यपदेशाच्चान्यः॥ २२॥

scripture describes things as they are. This is also because in a different context, it is stated about the Universal witness thus—'The form of this person is like a saffron coloured robe' (Bṛ. II-3-6) 'I know this great Person of sun-like lustre' (*Tait-Ār.* III-12-7) This passage also is found in the work Vākya. The phrase He is the Golden Person is to be explained on the similarity of colour of both, like in the case of the expression 'moon-face'. Dramiḍa himself, has commented upon the passage thus—'The affix, *mayaṭ*, is not used in the sense of modification; because the Self is not produced'. Thus the *Vedānta* texts determine the *Brahman*, who is other than the *Pradhāna* and the individual self. He has unlimited omniscience (Vipaścittva), whose natural characteristic is unsurpassed bliss, who possesses a divine form that is peculiar to Him, and not made of matter He is the Highest Person and the cause of the world. Thus there is not any defect.

22. *Bhedavyapadeśāccānyaḥ*

And He is different (from the sun and the other individual selves) because also there is the declaration of difference (between the *Brahman* on the one hand and the sun and other individual selves on the other).

"य आदित्ये तिष्ठन्नादित्यादन्तरो यमादित्यो न वेद यस्यादित्यः शरीरं य आदित्यमन्तरो यमयति [1]स त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृत इत्यधिदैवतम् । य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नित्यध्यात्मम् । यः सर्वेषु लोकेषु तिष्ठन्नित्यधिलोकम् । यः सर्वेषु भूतेषु तिष्ठन्नित्यधिभूतम् । यः सर्वेषु वेदेषु तिष्ठन्नित्यधिवेदम् । यः सर्वेषु यज्ञेषु तिष्ठन्नित्यधियज्ञम्" इत्यन्तर्यामिब्राह्मणे, सुबालोपनिषदि च "यः पृथिवीमन्तरे संचरन्" इत्यारभ्य "योऽव्यक्तमन्तरे संचरन्, योऽक्षरमन्तरे संचरन्, यो मृत्युमन्तरे संचरन्, यस्य मृत्युः शरीरं यं मृत्युर्न वेद, एष सर्वभूतान्तरात्मापहतपाप्मा दिव्यो देव एको नारायणः"

The scriptural text, 'He who dwelling in the sun, is within the sun, whom the sun does not know, whose body is the sun, who internally rules the sun—He is thy Self, internal ruler and immortal,' (*Mādh. Brh.* III-7-9) proves that He is greater than the gods. That He is above the individual self is stated in the scriptural text, 'He who dwelling in the individual self etc.' That, He is above the world, is stated in the scriptural text, 'He, who dwelling within all the worlds, etc.' The scriptural text, 'He, who dwelling within all beings' proves that He is greater than all beings. That He is above all the *Vedās* is stated in the scriptural text, 'He, who dwelling within all the *Vedās*, etc.' That He is above all sacrifices is stated in the text, 'He, who dwelling within all the sacrifices.' All these texts are found in *Antaryāmi-brāhmaṇa*. The *Subālopaniṣad* passage, beginning with 'who is moving within the earth' and proceeding 'who is moving within *Ayakta*, who is moving within *Akṣara* (imperishable), who is moving within *Mṛtyu* (death), whose body is *Mṛtyu*, whom *Mṛtyu* does not know. This is the Internal Self of all beings. This is free from all sins. He is the Divine Lord, He is the one Nārāyaṇa' (*Subā.* VII-1) points

[1] एष ते A 1.

इति सर्वदेवसर्वलोकसर्वभूतसर्ववेदसर्वयज्ञसर्वात्मोपरि वर्तमानतया तत्तच्छरीरकतया तत्तदन्तरात्मतया तत्तदवेद्यतया तत्तन्नियन्तृतया चैभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भेदव्यपदेशाच्चायमपहतपाप्मा[1] नारायणः प्रधानात् प्रत्यगात्मनश्चार्थान्तरभूतो निखिलजगदेककारणमिति सिद्धम् ।

आकाशाधिकरण प्राणाधिकरणं च ८, ९

आकाशस्तल्लिङ्गात् ॥ २३ ॥

अत एव प्राणः ॥ २४ ॥

out that He is above all gods, all worlds, all beings, all *Vedās*, all sacrifices, and all souls. He possesses them as His body. He is their Inner-Self. He is not apprehended by them. He is their controller. Thus he is described as different from all these. Hence it is proved, that *Nārāyaṇa*, who is free from all sins, and who is other than the *Pradhāna* and the individual selves, is the sole cause of the world.

ĀKĀS'ĀDHIKARAṆA 8
AND
PRĀṆĀDHIKARANA 9

23. *Ākās'astallingāt*

24. *Ata eva prāṇaḥ*

That which is denoted by the word *Ākās'a*, (is the *Brahman*); because His peculiar characteristics (are mentioned in the context in relation to what is denoted by that word).

For the same reason (which has been given in the case of *Ākās'a*), He, who is denoted by the word *Prāṇa* (also in the context is the Brahman).

[1] पाप्मादिः M 1.

"सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतान्याकाशादेव समुत्पद्यन्त आकाशं प्रत्यस्तं यन्ति" "सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतानि प्राणमेवाभिसंविशन्ति प्राणमभ्युज्जिहते" इत्यादौ "सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्" इत्यादिना सामान्येन निर्दिष्टस्य जगत्कारणस्य [1]भूताकाशप्राणसहचारिजीववाचि-शब्दाभ्यां विशेषनिर्णयशङ्कायां "सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतानि" इति प्रसिद्धवन्निर्दिश्यमानो[2] जगत्कारणत्वादिलिङ्गात् भूताकाशजीवाभ्यामर्थान्तर-भूतः परमपुरुष एवात्राकाशप्राणशब्दनिर्दिष्ट[3] इति निश्चीयते ।

Consider the texts, 'All these beings are, indeed, born out of the *Ākāśa*; they go unto the *Ākāśa* at the end'. (*Chānd.* I-9-1). 'All these beings, indeed, enter into the *Prāna* and are evolved out of the *Prāna*' (*Chānd.* I-11-5).

The doubt, that arises here, is this —These passages distinctly specify with the terms *Ākāśa* and *Prāna*, the universal cause mentioned in the text 'Existence alone, my dear boy, was in the beginning' with general term Sat. Here the terms *Ākāśa* and *Prāna* denote the popular ether (one of the five elements) and Jiva functioning with co-operation of vital breath of air. The doubt is cleared thus—In the texts quoted above the words *Ha vai* (indeed) point out that the reason for accepting the object as the universal cause is well-known. Therefore the cause denoted by the terms *Ākāśa* and *Prāna* must be the Highest Person who is distinct from the popular ether and vital air. Here what is well known is this—The Highest Person is the cause of the world. He became many as a result of His will. He possesses unsurpassed bliss. He grants bliss to the self.

[1] भूताकाशप्राणसहकारि A 1.
[2] निर्दिश्यमानात् M 1, 2.
[3] शब्दाभ्यां निर्दिष्टः A 1, M 3.

[1]प्रसिद्धिस्तु—बहुभवनसंकल्परूपेक्षणानवधिकातिशयानन्दजीवानन्दहेतुत्वविज्ञानमयविलक्षणत्वनिखिलभुवनभयाभयहेतुत्वसर्वलोकसर्वकामेशत्वसर्वपाप्मोदयाप्राकृतस्वासाधारणरूपविशिष्टस्य रविकरविकसितपुण्डरीकनयनस्य सर्वज्ञस्य सत्यसंकल्पस्य करणाधिपाधिपस्य परमपुरुषस्यैव निखिलजगदेककारणत्वमिति स एवाकाशप्राणशब्दाभ्यां जगत्कारणत्वेनाभिधीयत इति निश्चयो युक्त एव ॥

ज्योतिरधिकरणम् १०

ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात् ॥ २५ ॥

"अथ यदतः परो दिवो ज्योतिर्दीप्यते विश्वतः पृष्ठेषु सर्वतः

He is other than the *Vijñānamaya* (the individual self). He causes fear and non-fear to the whole world. He is the Lord of all worlds. He is the Lord of all desires. He is free from all evils. He possesses a divine form, that is peculiar to Him. His eyes resemble the lotus, that blossoms forth, when it is in contact with the rays of the sun. He is all-knowing and He possesses a true will. He is the Lord of the Lord of sense-organs. Therefore, it is right to conclude that the words, *Ākāśa* and *Prāṇa* refer to Him as the cause of the world.

JYOTIRADHIKARANA 10

25. *Jyotiścaraṇābhidhānāt*

That which is denoted by the word, *Jyotis*, (is the Brahman); because there is mention of (His) feet (in the connected context).

It is revealed in the scriptures to the effect—' Now that light which shines beyond this Heaven, on the backs of all

[1] तत्प्रसिद्धिस्तु A 1.

पृष्ठेष्वनुत्तमेषूत्तमेषु लोकेष्विदं वाव तद्यदिदमस्मिन्नन्तः पुरुषे ज्योतिः" इत्यत्र सर्वस्मात्परत्वेन निर्दिश्यमानतया सकलकारणभूतज्योतिषः कौक्षेयज्योतिषैक्याभिधानात्, स्ववाक्ये [1]विरोधिलिङ्गादर्शनाच्च प्रसिद्धमेव ज्योतिर्जगत्कारणत्वेन प्रतिपाद्यत इति शङ्कायां, यद्यपि स्ववाक्ये [1]विरोधि लिङ्गं न दृश्यते; तथापि पूर्वस्मिन् वाक्ये "पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि। त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि" इति प्रतिपादितस्य सर्वभूतचरणस्य परमपुरुषस्यैव द्युसंबन्धितयात्रापि प्रत्यभिज्ञानात् स एव ज्योतिःशब्देन सर्वस्मात् परत्वेन सकलकारणतयाभिधीयते। अस्य च कौक्षेयज्योतिषैक्याभिधानं फलायोपदिश्यत इति न कश्चिद्विरोधः। अखिलजगदेककारणभूतः परम-

the things, on the backs of everything, in the highest worlds than which there is no higher, that is that same as this light, indeed, which is here within the Person (*Chānd.* III-13-7). Here the following doubt arises—The word, *Jyotis* (light), is to be taken as the cause of the creation, etc. of the world; because it is denoted as Higher than all objects. It is also taught to be the same as digestive heat in the stomach. In this passage nothing is seen to prove contradiction with the supposition. Therefore, the popular *Jyotis* (light), alone is to be taken as the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

If it be so doubted, the reply is this—It is true that in this passage nothing is seen to prove contradiction with the supposition. Yet, in the same context, the passage—'All beings make up His one foot; His three feet represent the immortal beings in the Highest Heaven' (*Chānd.* III-12-6) occurs wherein all beings are declared to form the foot of this Highest Person who is in relation to the

[1] विरोध A 1, 2.

पुरुषोऽप्राकृतस्वासाधारणदिव्यवर्णो दिव्यरूपस्तमसः परस्ताद्वर्तत इति तस्यैव निरतिशयदीप्तियोगात् ज्योति शब्दाभिधेयत्वं विश्वतः पृष्ठेषु सर्वतः पृष्ठेष्वनुत्तमेषूत्तमेषु लोकेष्वप्राकृतेषु[1] वासश्च युज्यत एव ॥

छन्दोऽभिधानान्नेति चेन्न तथा चेतोऽर्पणनिगमात्तथा हि दर्शनम् ॥ २६ ॥

Highest Heaven. The same Person is recognized here. Hence the word, *Jyotis*, refers to Him, as the cause of the creation, etc. of the world and as higher than all objects. And, in the teaching that this *Jyotis* is one with the digestive heat of the stomach, there is nothing wrong ; because the oneness is enjoined for the purpose of meditation for attaining the desired result. The Highest Person is the only cause of the world. He possesses an extraordinary devine colour, that is peculiar to Him and not a modification of the *Prakṛti.* He possesses a divine form. He is beyond darkness (*i.e.* Prākrta world). He has unsurpassed lustre. Hence it is right to say that He who is denoted by the word *Jyotis*, lives on the back of all the worlds, on the back of everything and also in all the higher worlds than which there is no higher.

26. *Chandobhidhānānneti cenna tathā cetorpaṇanigamāt ; tathāhi darśanam*

If it be said that on account of the metre (*Gāyatrī*) being mentioned (in the context, the light or *Jyotis* mentioned above is) not the *Brahman*; it is not right to say so, because the teaching here relates to the concentration of the mind on the *Brahman* conceived as that same *Gāyatrī*; indeed the scripture declares it accordingly.

[1] अप्राकृतेषु omitted A 1, M 2, 3.

पूर्वत्र[1] "गायत्री वा इदं सर्वम्" इति गायत्र्याख्यं छन्दः प्रस्तुतमिति नात्र परमपुरुषाभिधानमिति चेत्; नैतत्, परमपुरुषस्यैव गायत्रीसादृश्यानुसंधानोपदेशात्,[2] तस्य छन्दोमात्रस्य सर्वभूतात्मकत्वानुपपत्तेरेवेति निगम्यते। अन्यत्रापि ह्यन्यस्य छन्दःसादृश्यात् छन्दोनिर्देशो दृश्यते—"ते वा एते पञ्चान्ये" इत्यारभ्य "सैषा विराट्" इत्यादौ ॥

भूतादिपादव्यपदेशोपपत्तेश्चैवम् ॥ २७ ॥

In a former passage in the same context, the metre known as the *Gāyatrī* is mentioned in the statement 'The *Gāyatrī*,[3] indeed, is all this' (*Chānd.* III-12-1). Therefore the Highest Person should not be taken to have been meant in the passages quoted above. To this question we say—This is not so. It is taught there that the Highest Person is to be meditated upon as similar to *Gāyatrī*. The conclusion is that it is impossible for that which is merely a metre to be in the form of all beings. Elsewhere, also a word, which ordinarily denotes a metre, is used to denote other thing in consequence of its similarity with it. *Vide* the passage beginning with—'Now these five and the other five' and ending with 'this same is virāj' (*Chānd.* IV-3-8).

27. Bhūtādipādavyapades'opapattes'caivam

Because also it is appropriate only thus to declare that (intelligent) beings and other objects form the feet (of the *Gāyatrī*).

[1] पूर्वम् M 2. [2] उपदेशत्वात् A 1.

[3] The metre, *Gāyatrī* is said to consist of four quarters of six syllables in each.

भूतपृथिवीशरीरहृदयैश्चतुष्पदेति व्यपदेशश्च परमपुरुषे गायत्रीशब्दनिर्दिष्टे ह्युपपद्यत इति पूर्वोक्तप्रकार एव समञ्जसः ॥

उपदेशभेदान्नेति चेन्नोभयस्मिन्नप्यविरोधात् ॥ २८ ॥

पूर्वत्र "त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि" इति परमपुरुषो व्यपदिश्यते। अत्र "अथ यदतः परो दिवः" इति पञ्चम्या निर्दिष्टद्युसंबन्धि ज्योतिरिति न प्रत्यभिज्ञेति चेत्; नैतत्, उभयस्मिन्नपि [1]व्यपदेशे विरोधाभावात्;

The declaration that it has four feet *namely* the beings, the earth, the body and the heart is appropriate only in relation to the Highest Person who is here denoted by the word, *Gāyatrī*. Therefore the above mentioned interpretation alone is right.

28. *Upadeśabhedānneti cennobhayasminnapyavirodhāt*

If it be said that, on account of there being a difference between the teachings (given in the context, what is denoted by the word *Jyotis*) is not the *Brahman*; it cannot be right to say so; because even in both those teachings there is nothing that is contradictory of each other.

In a former passage in the same context, *namely*, 'His three immortal feet are in the Highest Heaven' (*Chānd.* III-12-6), the Highest Person has been pointed out clearly. Here in the scriptural text, 'That *jyotis* which is beyond the Highest Heaven' (*Chānd.* III-13-7), what is denoted by the oblative case is the light that is related to the Highest Heaven. Hence what is described in the former passage cannot be recognised in this subsequent passage. It is not so;

[1] व्यपदेशविरोधाभावात् A 1, 2.

यथा वृक्षाग्रे श्येनः, वृक्षाग्रात्परतः श्येन इति व्यपदेशः। अत्र दिवः परत्व-मेवोभयत्र विवक्षितमित्यर्थः ॥

इन्द्रप्राणाधिकरणम् ११

प्राणस्तथानुगमात् ॥ २९ ॥

आत्मनां हिततमरूपमोक्षसाधनोपासनकर्मतया प्रज्ञातजीवभावस्ये-न्द्रस्य[1] "प्राणोऽस्मि प्रज्ञात्मा। तं मामायुरमृतमित्युपास्स्व" इति विधानात् स एव जगत्कारणम्। [2]कारणोपासनं हि मोक्षसाधनम्।

because there is nothing contradicory in the two statements. For an analogous example there is this instance—'The hawk is on the top of the tree' and 'The hawk is above the top of the tree'. Therefore the purport in both the passages is that He is beyond the Highest Heaven.

INDRAPRĀNĀDHIKARANA 11

29. *Prāṇastathānugamāt*

That which is denoted by the word *Prāṇa* (is the Brahman); because it is undetstood in the context.

The scriptural text is this—'Indeed, I am the *Prāna* and the omniscient self; worship and meditate on me as life and immortality" (*Kaus.* III-2). The doubt that arises here is this—The above mentioned text teaches that Indra who is known as Jīva (individual soul), is the object of man's meditation which would give him the Moksa, most beneficial one. He (Indra) alone is the cause of the world; because the meditation on universal cause alone is the means of Mokṣa. The scriptural text in support of this is this—

[1] स्वस्य M 2, 3. [2] जगत्कारणो A 1.

"तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये" इति श्रुतेरिति नाशङ्कनीयम् । प्राणशब्दसमानाधिकरणेन्द्रशब्दनिर्दिष्टो जीवादर्थान्तरभूत उक्तलक्षणः परमात्मैव । कुतः ? तथानुगमात्; परमात्मासाधारणानन्दाजरामृतादिष्वस्येन्द्रप्राणशब्दनिर्दिष्टस्यानुगमो हि दृश्यते "स एष प्राण एव प्रज्ञात्मानन्दोऽजरोऽमृतः" इति ॥

न वक्तुरात्मोपदेशादिति चेदध्यात्मसंबन्धभूमा ह्यस्मिन् ॥ ३० ॥

'So long as he is not freed from the body, so long there is delay; then he will reach the Brahman' (*Chānd.* VI-14-2).

To this doubt, the reply is this—This Being, who is denoted by the word, *Indra* mentioned in grammatical equation with the word *Prāṇa* is the Highest Self characterised above and other than the individual Self. Why? Because it is so understood in the sequal. The particular characteristics of the Highest Self, such as *Ānanda* (bliss), *Ajara* (undecaying) and *Amṛta* (immortal) are found in the Being, who is denoted by the words, *Indra* and *Prāṇa*. This is mentioned in the scriptural passage, 'That same *Prāṇa* is the omniscient self who is bliss, undecaying and immortal' (*Kauṣ*. III-9).

30. *Na vakturātmopadesāditi cedadhyātmasambhandhabhūmā hyasmin*

If it be said that on account of the speaker *Indra* declaring himself (to be the sujbect of worship) what is denoted by the words, *Indra* and *Prāṇa*) is not (the *Brahman*; it is replied that it cannot be right to say so); because there is here the mention of a multitude of attributes belonging to the Self.

उपक्रमे "मामेव विजानीहि" इति त्वाष्ट्रवधादिना प्रज्ञातजीवभावस्येन्द्रस्योपदेशादुपसंहारस्तदनुगुणो वर्णनीय इति चेत्; नैतत्; अध्यात्मसंबन्धभूमा ह्यस्मिन्। अध्यात्मम्; परमात्मधर्मः। परमात्मसंबन्धबहुत्वमस्मिन्निन्द्रशब्दाभिधेये वाक्योपक्रमप्रभृत्योपसंहाराद् दृश्यते "यं त्वं मनुष्याय हिततमं मन्यसे" इति हिततमोपासनं प्रारब्धम्। तच्च परमात्मधर्मः। "तमेवं विद्वानमृत इह भवति। नान्यः पन्थाः" इत्यादिश्रुतेः। तथा "एष एव साधु कर्म कारयति" इत्यादिना सर्वस्य कारयितृत्वम्,

In the beginning of the topic there is the statement, 'Know me alone' (*Kaus.* III-1). Here *Indra* is denoted as an individual self; because there are statements of attributes such as killing *Vṛtra*, etc.' The conclusion should also be in consonance with this statement. This is not so; because there is in the context the mention of a multitude of attributes belonging to the Self. The phrase 'the attributes belonging to the self' means the attributes of the Highest Self'. From the beginning to the end of the sentence, it is seen that he who is denoted by the word, *Indra*, possesses many attributes belonging to the Highest self. The scriptural statements made in the outset, *namely*, 'You yourself choose for me that boon, which you think most beneficial to man' (*Kaus.* III-1) starts with the worship, that is most beneficial to man That this worship is of the Highest Self is proved in the text, 'Thus knowing Him one becomes immortal here. There is no other path" (*Purusa Sūkta* 20). Similarly, the Supreme Self is the impeller of all activities, in accordance with the passage—'He Himself induces him to do good work whom He wishes to lead beyond these worlds, etc." (*Kauṣ.* III-8). So also He is the support

"एवमेवैता भूतमात्राः" इत्यारभ्य "प्रज्ञामात्राः प्राणेष्वर्पिताः" इति सर्वाधारत्वम्; तथानन्दादयश्च। "एष लोकाधिपतिः" इत्यादिना सर्वेश्वरत्वं च ॥

शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत् ॥ ३१ ॥

नामरूपव्याकरणादिशास्त्रात् सर्वैः शब्दैः परमात्मैवाभिधीयत इति दृष्ट्या तज्ज्ञापनायायमिन्द्रशब्देन परमात्मोपदेशः। शास्त्रस्था हि वामदेवादयस्तथैव वदन्ति "तद्धैतत्पश्यन् ऋषिर्वामदेवः प्रतिपेदे अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्च" इत्यादि ॥

of all, in accordance with the passage.' 'These subtle elements of beings are fixed on the elements of intelligence, and the elements of intelligence are fixed on the *Prāna*' *Kauṣ.* III-8). In the same way are stated the bliss and other attributes. That He is the Lord of all is proved by the statements, 'He is the Lord of all the worlds' (*Kauṣ.* III-8).

31. *S'āstradṛṣṭyā tūpades'o vāmadevavat*

And the teaching in the context is, in accordance with the view found in the scripture, as in the case of *Vāmadeva.*

All the words denote the Highest Self; because the scriptures state that He transforms Himself into a gross being having name and form. In order to make one remember this, the Highest Self is mentioned here by the word, *Indra*. *Vāmadeva* and others whe realised this truth of the scriptures state accordingly. *Vide* 'After seeing this, the sage *Vāmadeva* experienced—I have become *Manu* and the sun etc.' (*Bṛh.* I-4-10),

जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्नेति चेन्नोपासात्रैविध्यादाश्रितत्वादिह तद्योगात् ॥ ३२ ॥

"त्रिशीर्षाणं त्वाष्ट्रमहनम्" "यावद्ध्यस्मिन् शरीरे प्राणो वसति तावदायुः" इत्यादि जीवलिङ्गं मुख्यप्राणलिङ्गं चास्मिन् दृश्यत इति नैवमिति चेन्न; उपासात्रैविध्याद्धेतोर्जीवशब्देन प्राणशब्देन च परमात्मनोऽभिधानम् । अन्यत्रापि परमात्मनः स्वरूपेण, भोक्तृशरीरकत्वेन,

32. *Jīvamukhyaprāṇaliṅgānneti cennopāsātraividhyādāśritatvādiha tadyogāt*

If it be said, that on account of the characteristics of the individual self and of the principal vital air being mentioned in the context, there is no reference to the *Brahman* here at all, it is replied that it cannot be (right to say) so; because the worship of the Brahman has a three-fold nature; because this three-fold nature of His worship is taken for granted; and because here (*i.e.* in the present context also) that (same kind of worship) may be appropriately referred to.

The characteristics of the individual self are mentioned in the scriptural texts—'I killed the three-headed *Tvāṣṭra*,' (*Kaus.* III-1). In the same text are given the characteristics of the vital wind 'As long as the *Prāṇa* dwells in this body, so long surely there is life' (*Kaus.* III-2). Therefore it is presumed that the *Brahman* is not meant here. It is not so. The words referring to the individual self and *Prāna* denote the Highest Self; because the worship of the *Brahman* has a three-fold nature. In another context also it is meant to serve the object of teaching of

भोग्यभोगोपकरणशरीरकत्वेनेति त्रिविधमुपासनमाश्रितम् । यथा "सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म" इति स्वरूपेण, "तदनुप्रविश्य । सच्च त्यच्चाभवत्" इत्यादि "सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यमभवत्" इति भोक्तृशरीरकत्वेन भोग्यभोगोपकरणशरीरकत्वेन च । इहापि तत्संभवादेवमुपदेशः । "जन्माद्यस्य यतः" इत्यादिषु सद्ब्रह्मात्मेतिसामान्यशब्दैर्हि जगत्कारणं प्रकृतिपुरुषाभ्यामर्थान्तरमिति साधितम् । "ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात्" इत्यस्मिन् सूत्रे पुरुषसूक्तोदितो महापुरुषो जगत्कारणमिति विशेषतो निर्णीतम् । स

the three kinds of meditation in relation to the Highest Self, *namely*, the meditation of the Highest Self in His own essential nature, in His having the enjoyers or the individual selves for His body and having the enjoyable things and the auxiliary things of enjoyment for His body. In the following passage, *namely*, 'The *Brahman* is True, Knowledge and Infinite' (*Tait.* II-1), the meditation of the *Brahman* in His own essential nature is taken for granted. In the following passages, 'Having entered it, He became the *Sat* and the *tyat*' and 'while being the unchangeable one (*Satya*) and the changeable one, He has nevertheless remained true to His own nature' (*Tait.* II-6), the meditation of the Highest Self as having the enjoyers for His body and also as having the enjoyable things and the auxiliaries of enjoyment for His body is taken for granted. In the present context also, this three-fold meditation of the Highest Self is mentioned as it is appropriate. In the *Sūtra* I-1-2, the cause of the world, that is denoted by the words, Existence, *Brahman* and the Self is proved to be the Person other than the individual selves and *Prakṛti*. In the *Sūtra* I-1-25, the cause of the world has been specifically determined to be the Highest Person

एव प्रज्ञातजीववाचिभिरिन्द्रादिशब्दैरपि कचित् कचिच्छास्त्रदृष्ट्या तत्तच्छ-रीरकतया चोपास्यत्वायोपदिश्यत इति "शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत्" इति "उपासात्रैविध्यात्" इति च साधितम् ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे प्रथमस्या-
ध्यायस्य प्रथमः पादः ।

---

described in the *Puruṣasūkta*. He Himself is denoted by the words *Indra* etc. which are known to denote the individual selves primarily, because He has to be worshipped with the body of those things in accordance with the scriptures. This fact has been established in *Sūtras* I-1-31 and 32.

THUS ENDS THE 1ST PĀDA OF THE 1ST ADHYĀYA.

प्रथमाध्याये द्वितीयः पादः

सर्वत्र प्रसिद्ध्यधिकरणम् १

सर्वत्र प्रसिद्धोपदेशात् ॥ १ ॥

[1]सर्वत्र "सर्वं खल्विदम्" इति निर्दिष्टे तत्सामानाधिकरण्येन निर्दिष्टं ब्रह्म परमात्मा। कुतः? प्रसिद्धोपदेशात्; "तज्जलान्" इति हेतुतः सर्वात्मकत्वोपदेशादित्यर्थः। प्रसिद्धं हि हेतुतया व्यपदिश्यते। सकलो-

ADHYĀYA I, PĀDA II

SARVATRAPRASIDDHYADHIKARANA 1

1. *Sarvatra prasiddhopadesāt*

Everywhere (He is mentioned); because there is taught (in the scriptures) what is well-known.

The word *Brahman* that occurs in grammatical equation with what is mentioned in the text 'All this is indeed' (*Chānd.* III. 14-1) refers to the Highest Self. Why? Because in that *Upanishat* is taught that which is well-known. That all this is the *Brahman* is proved by the reason stated in the scriptural text, 'From Him springs the world, in Him it merges and by Him it lives.' (*Chānd.* III-14-1). What is well-known is said to serve the purpose of a reason. From all

[1] सर्वत्र omitted A 1.

पनिषत्सु ब्रह्मैव हि जगज्जनिलयजीवनहेतुतया प्रसिद्धं "यतो वा इमानि" इत्यादिषु ॥

विवक्षितगुणोपपत्तेश्च ॥ २ ॥

मनोमयत्वसत्यसंकल्पत्वादयो विवक्षिता गुणाः [1]ब्रह्मण्येवोपपद्यन्ते ॥

अनुपपत्तेस्तु न शारीरः ॥ ३ ॥

दुःखमिश्रपरिमितसुखलवभागिनि शारीरे त्वेषां[2] गुणानामनुपपत्तेर्न शारीरोऽयम् ॥

the Upanisadic passages such as 'From whom all these things are born' (*Tait.* III-1) the *Brahman* is well-known to be the cause of the creation, sustenance and destruction of the world.

2. *Vivakṣitaguṇopapatteśca*

And because the qualities meant to be stated, are possible (only in the *Brahman*).

The qualities meant to be stated, such as 'being knowable by mind alone' 'true will' etc. are justifiable only in the *Brahman*.

3. *Anupapattestu na śārīraḥ*

But on account of impossibility, (He is) not the embodied self.

These attributes are not justifiable in the embodied self, who enjoys sufferings mixed with a little pleasure. Hence this cannot be the embodied self.

[1] ब्रह्मणि एव M 3.　　　[2] तु omitted A 1.

कर्मकर्तृव्यपदेशाच्च ॥ ४ ॥

"एतमितः प्रेत्याभिसंभवितास्मि" इत्यभिसंभाव्याभिसंभवितृत्वेन प्रस्तुतब्रह्मजीवयोर्व्यपदेशादभिसंभाव्यं ब्रह्म जीवादर्थान्तरम् ॥

शब्दविशेषात् ॥ ५ ॥

"एष म आत्मान्तर्हृदये" इति षष्ठ्या प्रथमया च जीवो ब्रह्म च व्यपदिश्यते । ततश्चार्थान्तरम् ॥

स्मृतेश्च ॥ ६ ॥

4. *Karmakartṛvyapades'acca*

And because there is separate denotation of both as the object and the agent.

The scriptural statement, ' Departing hence, I shall attain Him ' (*Chānd.* III-14-4) denotes the *Brahman* as the object to be attained and the individual self as the agent who attains. Therefore, the object to be attained is the *Brahman*, who is other than the individual self.

5. *S'abdavis'eṣāt*

(It is so) on account (of the use) of words in different manner.

The scriptural text, ' He is my Self within the heart ' (*Chānd.* III-14-3) designates the embodied self with the word in the genitive case and also the *Brahman* with that in the nominative case.

6. *Smṛtes'ca*

And on account of the authority of *smṛti*.

[1]अत्र प्रथमया निर्दिष्टः पुरुषोत्तम इति निश्चीयते[2] । "सर्वस्य चाहं हृदि संनिविष्टः" इति हि स्मृतिः ॥

अर्भकौकस्त्वात्तद्व्यपदेशाच्च नेति चेन्न, निचाय्यत्वादेवं व्योमवच्च ॥ ७ ॥

"एष म आत्मान्तर्हृदयेऽणीयान् व्रीहेः" [3]इत्यादिनाल्पायतनत्वाल्पस्वरूपत्वव्यपदेशाच्च नायं पर इति चेत्, न; उपास्यत्वाद्धेतोस्तथा

It is determined that the Highest Person is exhibited in the nominative case here; because the *Smṛti* reveals thus—'And I dwell within the hearts of all' (*Bh. Gītā* XV-15).

7. *Arbhakaukastvāt tadvyapadeśācca neti cenna, nicāyyatvādevaṁ vyomavacca*

Should it be said that the passage does not refer to the *Brahman* on account of the smallness of the abode stated, and on account of denotation of that (*i.e.* minuteness of the being); we say no; because the *Brahman* has to be meditated upon thus, and because in the same passage He is said to be like ether.

The scriptural text, 'He is my Self within the heart and smaller than a grain of rice' (*Chānd.* III-14-3) declares the being as dwelling within the minute abode. He is also designated as having a minute size. Hence he is not the Highest one. It is not so. He has been so designated only

[1] अत्रापि M 1, 2, 3.　　　[2] निश्चयः M 1.

[3] इत्यादिनाल्पस्थानत्वा A 2, M 1, 2.

व्यपदेशः ; न स्वरूपाल्पत्वेन । व्योमवत् । स्वरूपमहत्त्वं चात्रैव व्यपदिश्यते, "ज्यायान् पृथिव्या ज्यायानन्तरिक्षात्" इत्यादिना ॥

संभोगप्राप्तिरिति चेन्न, वैशेष्यात् ॥ ८ ॥

परोऽप्यन्तःशरीरे वसति चेत्, जीववत् सुखदुःखोपभोगप्राप्तिः स्यादिति चेत्[1]; न, हेतुवैशेष्यात् । परस्य [2]हि स्वच्छन्दतो[3] जीवरक्षायै शरीरान्तर्वासः ॥

for the purpose of meditation and not because of His minute size. The illustrative example is the ether. The bigness of His size has been stated in the scriptural text, 'Greater than the earth, greater than the sky etc.' (*Chānd.* III-14-3).

8. Saṁbhogaprāptiriti cenna, vaiśeṣyāt

Should it be said that there is happening of fruition (of pleasure and pain in the Highest Person); we reply, not so, on account of distinction.

Suppose the Highest Person lives within the body of the individual selves; then He has to enjoy the fruits of pleasure and pain, as in the case of the individual selves. It is not so, because the difference of the cause of it. The Highest Person lives within the body of the individual selves, only on His own will in order to save them.

[1] चेमैतत् A 1.
[2] हि omitted M 1.
[3] छन्दतो M 3.

अत्त्रधिकरणम् २

अत्ता चराचरग्रहणात् ॥ ९ ॥

"यस्य ब्रह्म च क्षत्रं च उभे भवत ओदनः ।
मृत्युर्यस्योपसेचनं क इत्था वेद यत्र सः ॥"

इत्यत्रौदनोपसेचन[1]सूचितोऽत्ता परमपुरुषः, ब्रह्मक्षत्रोपलक्षितस्य चराचरस्य कृत्स्नस्य मृत्यूपसेचनत्वेनादनीयतया ग्रहणात् ॥

प्रकरणाच्च ॥ १० ॥

ATTRADHIKARANA 2

9. *Attā carācaragrahaṇāt*

The eater (is the Highest Self); because (He) takes for food, all that is movable and immovable.

'Who really knows where He is, to whom both *Brāhmanas*[2] and *Ksattriyas*[2] are food and death is a condiment.' (*Kath.* I-2-25). Here the eater suggested by the words, food and condiment, is the Highest Self; because He is said to be the eater of all that is movable and immovable, implied by the words, the *Brāhmanas* and *Ksattriyas* using the death as condiment.

10. *Prakaraṇācca*

And (also) on account of the context.

[1] उपसेचन omitted A 1.

[2] The *Brāhmaṇas* are of the priestly class and the *Kṣattriyas* are of the warrior class

"महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति" "नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यः" इत्यादिना परस्यैव प्रकृतत्वात्स एवायम् ॥

गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्दर्शनात् ॥ ११ ॥

अनन्तरम् "ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके गुहा प्रविष्टौ परमे परार्ध्ये" इत्यादिना जीवपरमात्मानावेव प्रयोज्यप्रयोजकभावेन कर्मफलाशनेऽन्वयादुपदिष्टौ, तयोरेवास्मिन् प्रकरणे गुहाप्रवेशदर्शनात्; "तं दुर्दर्श

There are scriptural texts—'The wise, who knows the Self, the Great and Omnipresent, does not grieve' (*Kath.* I-2-22). 'This Self is not to be obtained by instruction' (*Kath.* I-2-23). These passages refer to the Highest Person only according to the context and therefore He alone is meant here.

11. *Guhām praviṣṭāvātmānau hi taddarśanāt*

The 'two entered into the cave' are the two selves on account of this being seen (in the scriptures).

In the scriptural passage 'The two, drinking the reward of the good action in the world, have entered the cave in the excellent and highest sphere,' (*Kaṭh.* I-3-1) are mentioned the individual self and the Supreme Self only as they are connected as an impeller and impelled, with the enjoyment of the reward of action, as they only are said to have entered the cave in this context. Of these, the Highest Self is referred to in the text 'Him, who is difficult to see, hidden, entered into the beings and set in the cave' (*Kath.* I-2-12). The ndividual self is referred to in the text, 'Who is together

गूढमनुप्रविष्टं गुहाहितम्" इति परस्य, "या प्राणेन संभवत्यदितिर्देवतामयी गुहां प्रविश्य तिष्ठन्ती" इति जीवस्य। कर्मफलाद[1]नाददितिर्जीवः॥

विशेषणाच्च ॥ १२ ॥

जीवपरावेव हि सर्वत्रास्मिन् प्रकरणे विशेष्येते। "न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चित्" इत्यादौ जीवः; "अणोरणीयान् महतो महीयान्" "महान्तं विभुमात्मानम्" "नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन"

with the vital breath, who is *aditi*, who functions with the senses, and who entering into the cave abides therein.' (*Kath.* II-1-7). Here (what is denoted by the word), *aditi* is the individual self as he eats the fruit of his action.

12. *Viśeṣaṇācca*

And on account of distinctive qualities (apprehended in the individual selves and the Highest Self).

Everywhere in the context the distinctive qualities of the individual selves and the Highest Self are stated. The individual self is referred to in the scriptural text—'The wise one (*Vipaścit*) is not born nor dies' (*Kath* I-2-18).

The Highest Self is referred to in the following texts—

(1) 'He is more minute than the minute and more huge than the huge' (*Kaṭh.* I-2-20).

(2) 'The Great and All-pervading Soul' (*Kaṭh.* I-2-22).

(3) 'This Self is not to be obtained by teaching' (*Kaṭh.* I-2-23).

[1] न्यतीत्यदितिः M 2.

"विज्ञानसारथिर्यस्तु मनःप्रग्रहवान्नरः ।
सोऽध्वनः पारमाप्नोति तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥"

इत्यादिषु परः । "त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि" "अथ यदतः परो दिवो ज्योतिर्दीप्यते विश्वतः पृष्ठेषु सर्वतः पृष्ठेष्वनुत्तमेषूत्तमेषु लोकेषु" इति विश्वतः प्राकृतात् स्थानात् परं विष्णोः [1]परमं स्थानमेव हि संसाराध्वनः पारभूतं मुमुक्षुभिः प्राप्यं "तद्विष्णोः परमं पदं सदा पश्यन्ति सूरयः" "तदक्षरे

(4) 'But who has understanding for his charioteer, and holds the reins of the mind, he reaches the destination of his journey that highest place of *Viṣṇu*' (*Katha.* I-3-9).

The scriptural texts, 'His three immortal feet are in the Highest Heaven' (*Chānd.* III-12-6) and 'Now that Light, which shines beyond this Highest Heaven, beyond all the things in the universe, beyond the whole universe, in the highest world than which there are no higher worlds,' (*Chānd.* III-13-7) state that the aspirant of *Mukti* (*i.e.* final release) desires to reach the place of *Viṣṇu*, which is higher than this world of *Prakṛti* and which is beyond the reach of the path leading to *Saṁsāra*.[2] This has been established in all the Upanishads thus—

(1) 'The wise sages always see the Highest Heaven of *Viṣṇu*' (*Tait. Sam.* I-3-6).

(2) 'He is in the imperishable Highest Heaven' (*Tait.* II-1-1).

[1] परं M 2.

[2] *Samsara* means the circuit of mundane existence consisting of frequent births and deaths and all their consequences

परमे व्योमन्" "क्षयन्तमस्य रजसः पराके" "विश्वं पुराणं तमसः परस्तात्" "ते ह नाकं महिमानः सचन्ते । यत्र पूर्वे साध्याः सन्ति देवाः" इत्यादिसकलोपनिषत्प्रसिद्धम् ॥

अन्तराधिकरणम् ३

अन्तर उपपत्तेः ॥ १३ ॥

"य [1]एषोऽक्षिणि पुरुषो दृश्यत एष आत्मेति होवाच । [2]एतदमृतमभयमेतद्ब्रह्म" इत्यत्राक्ष्याधारः परमपुरुषः, निरुपाधिकामृतत्वाभयत्वसंयद्वामत्वादीनां [3]तस्मिन्नेवोपपत्तेः ॥

(3) ' Him who is dwelling in the place which is beyond the Rajas ' (*Tait Sam.* II-2-12-5).

(4) ' The All-pervading one, ancient, and beyond the reach of darkness ' (*Tait* II-1-1).

(5) ' Those, who are great, indeed reach the Heaven where there are ancient gods known as *Sādhyas* ' (*Tait. Ār.* III-12-39)

ANTARĀDHIKARANA 3

13. *Antara upapatteḥ*

(The person) within (the eye) is the Highest Self; because (it is so) apprehended in (scriptural texts).

' The person, who is seen in the eye, is the Self, said he. This is the Immortal and Fearless, This is the *Brahman*' (*Chānd.* IV-15-1). Here the Person, who is said to be in the eye, is the Highest Person. The qualities such as deathlessness, fearlessness and *Samyadvāmatva* [4] etc., that have no limiting conditions, can be possible only in the Highest Self.

[1] एषोऽन्तरक्षिणि M 1. [2] एतदभयममृत M 3. [3] अस्मिन्नेव A 1, 2.

[4] He is called Samyadvāma as all blessings go towards Him.

स्थानादिव्यपदेशाच्च ॥ १४ ॥

"यश्चक्षुषि तिष्ठन्" इत्यादिना स्थितिनियमनादिव्यपदेशाच्चायं परः ॥

सुखविशिष्टाभिधानादेव च ॥ १५ ॥

"कं ब्रह्म खं ब्रह्म" इति पूर्वत्रास्यैव सुखविशिष्टतयाभिधानाच्चायं परः ॥

अत एव च स ब्रह्म ॥ १६ ॥

यतस्तत्र [1]भवभीतायोपकोसलाय ब्रह्म जिज्ञासवे "कं ब्रह्म खं ब्रह्म"

14. *Sthānādivyapadeśācca*

And on account of the statement as to the abode, etc.

That He dwells within the eye and at the same time He rules over the eye is proved in the text, 'He who dwells within the eye etc.' (*Bṛh.* III-7-18). Therefore this must be the Highest Self.

15. *Sukhaviśiṣṭābhidhānādevaca*

And on account of the very same text referring to what is characterised by Pleasure.

The scriptural text, 'Pleasure is the *Brahman*. Ether is the *Brahman*' (*Chānd.* IV-10-5) refers only to what is characterised by Pleasure. Hence this must be the Highest Self.

16. *Ata eva ca sa Brahma*

For that very reason that (ether) is the *Brahman*.

Here *Upakosala* being afraid of *Saṁsāra*, made the inquiry about the *Brahman*. Then he was taught that the Pleasure was the *Brahman* and the Ether was the *Brahman*.

[1] भवभय M 1, 2.

इत्युपदिष्टः "यद्वाव कं तदेव खम्" इति सुखरूपः, अतः खशब्दाभिधेय आकाशः परमेव ब्रह्म ॥

श्रुतोपनिषत्कगत्यभिधानाच्च ॥ १७ ॥

श्रुतब्रह्मस्वरूपाणामधिगन्तव्याया अर्चिरादिगतेरक्षिपुरुषं श्रुतवते "तेऽर्चिषमेवाभिसंभवन्ति" इत्यादिनाभिधानाच्चायं परमपुरुषः ॥

अनवस्थितेरसंभवाच्च नेतरः ॥ १८ ॥

Again it has been stated 'That which is denoted by the word 'Pleasure' is identical with that denoted by the word 'Ether' (*Chānd.* IV-10-5). Therefore the Ether identified with the Pleasure, is the Highest *Brahman.*

17. *S'rutopaniṣatkagatyabhidhānācca*

And on account of the statement of the way of him who has heard of the Upaniṣads.

For him who has heard of the Person within the eye, the scriptural passage 'They go to light etc.' (*Chānd.* IV-15-5) prescribes the same way marked with light etc. as prescribed for them who have heard of the true nature of the *Brahman.* Hence this is the Highest Person.

18. *Anavasthiterasaṁbhavācca netaraḥ*

(It) cannot (be) any other (than the Highest Self) on account of its non-residence (in eye) and of the impossibility (of possessing the characteristics described).

परस्मादितरो जीवादिर्नाक्ष्याधारः; चक्षुषि नियमेनानवस्थितेः, अमृतत्वाद्यसंभवाच्च ॥

अन्तर्याम्यधिकरणम् ४

अन्तर्याम्यधिदैवाधिलोकादिषु तद्धर्मव्यपदेशात् ॥१९॥

"यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्" इत्यादिष्वधिदैवाधिलोकादिपदचिह्नितेषु वाक्येषु श्रूयमाणोऽन्तर्यामी परमपुरुषः, सर्वान्तरत्वसर्वाविदितत्वसर्वशरीरकत्वसर्वनियन्तृत्वादिपरमात्मधर्मव्यपदेशात् ॥

The individual selves, etc. who are other than the Highest Self, cannot have their residence in the eye. They do not always reside in the eye and they do not (possess the characteristics) of immortality etc.

ANTARYĀMYADIKARANA 4

19. *Antaryāmyadhidaivādhilokādiṣu taddharma-vyapadeśāt*

The Internal Ruler (referred to) in the texts with respect to the Gods, with respect to the worlds, etc. (is the Highest Person); because the attributes of Him are mentioned.

The Internal Ruler, mentioned in the various passages in respect of the Gods, in respect of the worlds etc., is the Highest Person; because the qualities of the Highest Person, such as, being the Internal Ruler, being unknown by all, having all as His body, being the All-controller and so on, are mentioned there.

न च स्मार्तमतद्धर्माभिलापाच्छारीरश्च ॥ २० ॥

नायं प्रधानं जीवश्च, तयोरसंभावितसर्वाविदितत्वादिधर्माभिलापात्[1]। असंभावनया यथा न स्मार्तम्, तथा जीवोऽपीत्यर्थः ॥

उभयेऽपि हि भेदेनैनमधीयते ॥ २१ ॥

उभये काण्वा माध्यंदिनाश्च, "यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन्" "य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोऽन्तरो यमात्मा न वेद यस्यात्मा शरीरं य आत्मानमन्तरो

20. *Na ca smārtamataddharmābhilāpacchārīraśca*

This is not the Smārta *i.e. Pradhāna*; on account of the declaration of the qualities not belonging to it; nor the embodied self.

Neither the *Pradhāna* nor the individual self is He; because the qualities such as becoming unknown to all which are not impossible in them, have been mentioned therein. Just as He cannot be the *Pradhāna*, because these qualities are impossible in it, for the same reason, He cannot be the individual self also.

21. *Ubhayepi hi bhedenainam adhīyate*

For, both (also) speak of Him as something different.

Both, the *Mādhyamdinas* and the *Kāṇvas,* speak of the Inner Ruler as being different from the individual self. The scriptural text meant here is this—'He who dwelling within the knowledge' 'He, who dwelling in the individual self, is within the individual self, whom

[1] सर्वात्मत्वादि॰ A 2.

यमयति" इति प्रत्यगात्मनो भेदेनैनमन्तर्यामिणमधीयते । अतः पर एवायम् ॥

अदृश्यत्वादिगुणकाधिकरणम् ५

अदृश्यत्वादिगुणको धर्मोक्तेः ॥ २२ ॥

"अथ परा यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यते" "यत्तदद्रेश्यम्" इत्यारभ्य "यद्भूतयोनिं परिपश्यन्ति धीराः" "अक्षरात् परतः परः" इत्यादौ प्रधानात्प्रत्यगात्मनश्चार्थान्तरभूतः परमात्मा प्रतिपाद्यते, "यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्" इत्यादिधर्मोक्तेः ॥

the individual self does not know, whose body is the individual self, who internally rules the individual self.' (*Mādh. Bṛh.* III-7). Therefore this is only the Highest One.

ADRS'YATVĀDIGUṆAKĀDHIKARANA 5

22. *Adṛs'yatvādiguṇako dharmokteḥ*

He who possesses the qualities of invisibility etc. (is the Highest Self); on account of the declaration of the attributes.

'Now, the higher knowledge is that whereby the Imperishable One is apprehended' (*Muṇḍ.* I-1-5).

'Him who is Invisible' (*Muṇḍ.* I-1-6).

'The wise see Him to be the origin of beings' (*Muṇḍ.* I-1-6).

'The Higher than that which is higher than the imperishable (*Pradhāna*)' (*Muṇḍ.* II-1-2).

These texts teach about the Highest Self, who is other than the individual self and the *Pradhāna*. His attributes have been declared in the scriptural text, 'He who understands all and knows all' (*Muṇḍ.* I-1-9).

विशेषणभेदव्यपदेशाभ्यां च नेतरौ ॥ २३ ॥

एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानरूपविशेषणव्यपदेशान्न प्रधानम्। "अक्षरात् परतः परः" इति प्रधानात्परतः प्रत्यगात्मनोऽपि पर इति भेदव्यपदेशान्न प्रत्यगात्मा च। अथवा सामानाधिकरण्येन परतोऽक्षरात् [1]पञ्चविंशकात् पर इति भेदव्यपदेशः ॥

23. *Vis'eṣaṇabhedavyapades'ābhyāṁ ca nētarau*

He is not the two others (*i.e.* the *Pradhāna* and the individual self), on account of (the mention of) particular attribute and the statement of difference.

He is not the *Pradhāna*, because of the particularisation of the character, *namely* the attainment of the knowledge of all through the knowledge of one. He is not the individual self, because of the difference mentioned in the text 'He is different from him (*Jīva*) who is different from *Aksara*' (*Muṇḍ.* II-1-2). Here the word *Akṣara* means the *Pradhāna*. The individual self is different from the *Pradhāna*. The *Brahman* is different from the individual self. Or the scriptural text quoted above may be interpreted thus, taking the two words *viz. Akṣarāt* and *Parataḥ* in grammatical equation (*Sāmānādhikaraṇya*)—The Lord is different from the *Akṣara*, the 25th entity *i.e.* the individual self who is altogether distinct from the *Pradhāna* and its modifications.

[1] पञ्चविंशात् M 2.

According to S'ri Rāmānuja's view, the Tattvas or entities are of 26 kinds. They are—1 Prakṛti, 2 Mahat, 3 Ahamkāra, 4 to 9 Jñānendriyas 6 (organs of sense), 10 to 14 Karmendriyas 5 (organs of action), 15 to 19 Tanmātras 5 (subtle elements), 20 to 24 Bhūtas 5 (gross elements), 25 the Individual self and 26 the Supreme Self.

रूपोपन्यासाच्च ॥ २४ ॥

" अग्निर्मूर्धा " इत्यादिना त्रैलोक्यशरीरोपन्यासाच्च परमात्मा ॥

वैश्वानराधिकरणम् ६

वैश्वानरः साधारणशब्दविशेषात् ॥ २५ ॥

" आत्मानमेवेमं वैश्वानरम् " इत्यादौ वैश्वानरः परमात्मा, जाठराग्न्यादिषु साधारणस्यापि वैश्वानरशब्दस्यास्मिन् प्रकरणे परमात्मासाधारणैः सर्वात्मत्वब्रह्मशब्दादिभिर्विशेष्यमाणत्वात् ॥

24. *Rūpopanyāsācca*

And on account of the description of His form.

He is the Highest Self; because He is stated to have the three worlds for His body in the following text: 'Fire is His head' (*Muṇd.* II-1-4).

VAIS'VĀNARĀDHIKARANA 6

25. *Vais'vānaraḥ sādhāraṇas'abdaviseṣāt*

Vais'vānara (is the Highest Self); on account of the mention of special characteristics (in the context) in spite of that (word) being used as general term.

The word, *Vaisvānara*, occurring in the scriptural text, 'Now you meditate that *Vais'vānara* Self' (*Chānd.* V-11-6) refers to the Highest Self. The word, *Vais'vānara*, applies generally to the fire in the stomach etc. also; but in this context it refers to the Highest Self; because there is the mention of the peculiar characteristics of the Highest Self, *namely*, being the Self of all objects and denoted by the word *Brahman*.

स्मर्यमाणमनुमानं स्यादिति ॥ २६ ॥

[1]द्युलोकप्रभृति पृथिव्यन्तं रूपम् "अग्निर्मूर्धा" इत्यादिषूक्तमत्र प्रत्यभिज्ञायमानमस्य परमात्मत्वेऽनुमानं लिङ्गमित्यर्थः ॥

शब्दादिभ्योऽन्तः प्रतिष्ठानाच्च नेति चेन्न, तथा दृष्ट्युपदेशादसंभवात् पुरुषमपि चैनमधीयते ॥ २७ ॥

"स एषोऽग्निर्वैश्वानरः" इत्यग्निशब्दसामानाधिकरण्यात्, प्राणा-

26. *Smaryamāṇamanumānam syāditi*

That which is recognised (as stated in other text) is an inferential mark.

The form of *Vais'vānara* starts from the heavens and ends with the earth These forms are stated in the text, 'Fire is His head etc.' (*Mund.* II-1-4) These peculiar characteristics of the Highest Self are recognised (as stated in other text) and they are the inferential marks.

27. *S'abdādibhyontaḥ pratiṣṭhānācca neti cenna, tathā dṛṣṭyaupades'ādasaṁbhavāt puruṣamapi caınamadhīyate*

Should it be said that it is not so, on account of the reasons *namely* distinguishing word ete. and the statement of his abiding with in; we say no; on account of the meditation being directed on that way; on account (of such a thing) being impossibility and because they read of Him as 'Person'.

Here there is an objection—In the scriptural text, 'He

[1] द्युलोकादि A 2.

इत्याधारत्वादिभ्यः,[1] "पुरुषेऽन्तः प्रतिष्ठितम्" इत्यादेश्च नायं परमात्मेति चेत्; नैतत्, जाठराग्निशरीरकत्वेनोपास्यत्वोपदेशात्, केवलजाठराग्नेस्त्रैलोक्यशरीरकत्वाद्यसंभवाच्च "स एषोऽग्निर्वैश्वानरो यत्पुरुषः" इत्येनं वैश्वानरं पुरुषमप्यधीयते वाजिनः। निरुपाधिकपुरुषशब्दश्च परमात्मनि नारायण एव "सहस्रशीर्षं देवम्" इत्यारभ्य "विश्वमेवेदं पुरुषः" इत्यादिषु प्रसिद्धः॥

अत एव न देवता भूतं च ॥ २८ ॥

is *Agni Vais'vānara'* (*Pras'.* I-7), the word, *Agni* is used in the same grammatical equation with the word *Vais'vānara,* he is the abode of the *Prāṇāhuti* (oblation to *prāna. i.e.* vital air) and there is the scriptural text, 'Abiding within the person'. (*S'ata. Br.* 10-6-1-11) Hence he is not the Highest Self. To this objection, this is answer. It is not so; because it is taught that He has to be meditated upon as having the fire of the stomach, as His body. Moreover the fire in the stomach cannot have the three worlds, as its body. The scriptural text of the *Vājasaneyins,* 'This is the *Agni Vais'vānara* same as the *Puruṣa*' (*S'ata. Br.* 10-6-1-11) teaches that the *Vais'vānara* is the Person. The word, Person, without any limiting conditions attached to it, applies only to the Lord *Nārāyaṇa,* the Highest Self. This is said clearly in the text, beginning with 'The thousand-headed God' and ending with, 'All this universe is the Person,' (*Tait.* II-II-1).

28. *Ata eva na devatā bhūtaṁ ca*

For the same reason (*Vais'vānara*) is not the minor deity nor the Bhūta (element).

[1] दिभिः A 1.

यतोऽयं वैश्वानरस्त्रैलोक्यशरीरः पुरुषशब्दनिर्दिष्टश्च, ततोऽयं नाग्न्याख्या देवता, न[1] तृतीयमहाभूतं च ॥

साक्षादप्यविरोधं जैमिनिः ॥ २९ ॥

नावश्यमग्निशरीरकत्वेनोपास्यत्वायेदमग्निशब्दसामानाधिकरण्यम्; अग्रनयनादियोगेन परमात्मन्येवाग्निशब्दस्य साक्षाद्वृत्तेः सामानाधिकरण्याविरोधं जैमिनिराचार्यो मन्यते ॥

अभिव्यक्तेरित्याश्मरथ्यः ॥ ३० ॥

Because *Vaiśvānara* mentioned here is known to have the three worlds as His body and is denoted by the word, Person, He is not the minor deity called *Agni* (*i.e.* fire) nor is he the third *Mahā-Bhūta* (gross element *i.e* fire).

29. *Sākṣādapyavirodham Jaiminiḥ*

Jaimini opines that there is no inconsistency (because the word, *Agni*) directly (denotes the Highest Self).

It is not necessary to hold that the word '*Agni*' is used here in the same grammatical equation with a view to teach that the *Brahman* should be meditated having the fire as His body. The word '*Agni*' directly refers to the Highest Self, as He takes the foremost part among gods. Therefore, *Ācārya Jaimini* opines that nothing is contradicted here

30. *Abhivyakterityāśmarathyaḥ*

On account of revelation; so *Āśmarathya* opines.

[1] न omitted M 1, 2.

" यस्त्वेतमेवं प्रादेशमात्रम् " इत्यनवच्छिन्नस्य [1]द्युप्रभृतिपरिच्छिन्नत्व-मुपासकाभिव्यक्त्यर्थमित्याश्मरथ्यः ॥

अनुस्मृतेर्बादरिः ॥ ३१ ॥

द्युप्रभृतिपृथिव्यन्तानां मूर्धादिपादान्तावयवत्वकल्पनं तथानुस्मृत्यर्थं ब्रह्मप्रतिपत्तय इति बादरिः ॥

संपत्तेरिति जैमिनिस्तथा हि दर्शयति ॥ ३२ ॥

" उर एव वेदिर्लोमानि बर्हिर्हृदयं गार्हपत्यः " इत्यादिनोपासकहृदया-

Āśmarathya is of opinion that, for the sake of revelation to those who resort to meditation, He is mentioned as measured by the heaven and other regions, though He is really immeasurable.

31. *Anusmṛterbādariḥ*

On account of meditation ; (so) *Bādari* opines.

The Supreme self is represented having as the limbs from the head to the foot, the regions beginning from the sky and ending with the earth. What the text enjoins is devout meditation in that form for the purpose of reaching the *Brahman*.

32. *Sampatteriti Jaiministathā hi darśayati*

On account of imaginative identification; thus Jaimini thinks; for the text declares thus.

In the scriptural text, 'The chest is the sacrificial altar, the hairs are the *Kuśa* grass, the heart is the *Gārhapatya* fire' (*Chānd.* V-18-2), there is the imaginative identification of the heart etc. of the devotee with

[1] द्युप्रभृतिप्रादेश M 2.

दीनां वेद्यादित्वकल्पनं विद्याङ्गभूतायाः प्राणाहुतेरग्निहोत्रत्वसंपादनार्थमिति जैमिनिः। दर्शयति च श्रुतिः "य एतदेवं विद्वानग्निहोत्रं जुहोति" इति। एते पक्षाः स्वीकृताः। पूजार्थमाचार्यग्रहणम् ॥

आमनन्ति चैनमस्मिन् ॥ ३३ ॥

एनं परमात्मानमस्मिन्नुपासकशरीरे प्राणाहुतिवेलायामनुसंधानार्थं "तस्य ह वा एतस्य+मूर्धैव सुतेजाः" इत्यामनन्ति च। उपासकस्य मूर्धादिरेवास्य परमात्मनो मूर्धादिरित्यर्थः ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे प्रथमस्याध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः

---

the sacrificial altar etc. So that the *Prānāhuti* (oblation to *Prāna*) which forms a helpful part of the Vidyā (meditation) may serve the purpose of *Agnihotra*. This is the opinion of *Jaimini*. The scriptural text in support of this view is this:—'He who offers the *Agnihotra* knowing it thus' (*Chānd.* V-24-2). These views are acceptable. The names of *Ācāryas* are mentioned as a mark of respect.

33. *Āmananti cainamasmin*

Moreover, they record Him in this.

They recite the following scriptural text, *Viz.* 'The brightly shining heaven is the head of the Self' (*Chānd.* V-18-2) and opine that the Highest Self should be meditated in the body of the devotee at the time of *Prānāhuti* (the offering of the oblation to *Prāna*). The conclusion is that the head etc. of the devotee *is the* head etc. of the Highest Self.

THUS ENDS THE 2ND PĀDA OF THE 1ST ADHYĀYA

प्रथमाध्याये तृतीयः पादः

द्युभ्वाद्यधिकरणम् १

द्युभ्वाद्यायतनं स्वशब्दात् ॥ १ ॥

"यस्मिन् द्यौः पृथिवी चान्तरिक्षम्" इत्यादौ द्युपृथिव्यादीनामायतनमाधारः परमपुरुषः, "तमेवैकं जानथात्मानम्" इत्यात्मशब्दात्। निरुपाधिकात्मत्वं हि परमपुरुषस्यैव। "अमृतस्यैष सेतुः" इति तदेव

ADHYĀYA I, PĀDA III

DYUBHVĀDYADHIKARAṆA 1

1. *Dhyubhvādyāyatanaṁ Svaśabdāt*

The abode of heaven, earth etc. (is the Highest Self), on account of (the use of) the term that refers to Him.

In the Scriptural text—'In whom the heaven, the earth and the sky are woven' (*Mund.* II-2-5), it is stated that He is the abode or support of heaven, etc. Here the Highest Self is so meant, because in the same text the word, Ātman (Self) is used *viz.*—'Know Him alone as the one Self' (*Muṇd.* II-2-5). The aspect of being the Self without any condition, has to be applied only to the Highest-Person. This fact has been supported by the scriptural text 'He is the *Setu* (bridge) to

द्रढयति । "बहुधा जायमानः" इत्यपि परत्वं न निवारयति । "अजायमानो बहुधा विजायते" इति कर्मभिरजायमानस्यैवाश्रितवात्सल्याच्छन्दतो जननं हि तस्य श्रूयते ॥

मुक्तोपसृप्यव्यपदेशाच्च ॥ २ ॥

"तदा विद्वान् पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति" "तथा विद्वान्नामरूपाद्विमुक्तः परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम्" इति च पुण्यपापनामरूपविनिर्मुक्तानां[1] प्राप्यतया व्यपदेशाच्चायं परः ॥

Immortality' (*Mund.* II-2-5). The scriptural text, 'Becoming many' (*Muṇd.* II-2-6) does not exclude Him as possessing the characteristics of the Highest Self. The *S'ruti* passage 'Though unborn, He is born as many' (*Tait. Ār.* III-13-1) teaches that He is not born due to His past actions; but He is born as and when He desires, on account of the love that He bears towards His dependants.

2. *Mukṭopasṛpyavyapades'acca*

And on account of His being declared that to Him the released souls have to resort.

'Then, the knower shaking off good and evil and free from stains, attains the highest equality' (*Muṇd.* III-1-3). 'So the knower being freed from name and form, goes to the Heavenly Person, who is higher than the high' (*Muṇḍ.* III-2-8). Here it is declared that He is to be attained by those, who are freed from good and evil as well as name and form. Hence the Highest Person is to be taken as referred to here.

[1] नामरूप omitted A 1, M 1.

नानुमानमतच्छब्दात्प्राणभृच्च ॥ ३ ॥

यथा न प्रधानमतच्छब्दात्, तथा न प्राणभृदपीत्यर्थः ॥

भेदव्यपदेशात्[1] ॥ ४ ॥

"अनीशया शोचति मुह्यमान । जुष्टं यदा पश्यत्यन्यमीशम्" इत्यादिना प्रत्यगात्मनो भेदेन व्यपदेशाच्चायं[2] परः ॥

प्रकरणात् ॥ ५ ॥

3. *Nānumānamatacchabdāt Prāṇabhṛcca*

It is not the Ānumāna (*Pradhāna*), on account of absence of words denoting it; and so also it is not the bearer of the *Prāṇas* (*i.e.* the individual self).

The meaning is this :—' Just as this is not the *Pradhāna*, because there are no words in the context to indicate it, so also this is not the bearer of the *Prāṇas* (*i.e.* the individual self).

4. *Bhedavyapadeśāt*

On account of the declaration of difference.

The Highest Person is meant here, because He is mentioned as different from the individual self. This is proved in the text, 'The individual self being influenced by the impotent Prakṛti, becomes ignorant and feels sorry. When he sees the other, the Lord, pleased well and His greatness then becomes relieved from grief,' (*Muṇd.* III-1-2).

5. *Prakaraṇāt*

On account of the context.

[1] व्यपदेशाच्च, M 3. [2] भेदव्यपदेशाच्चायं, M 2.

"अथ परा यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यते" इत्यादि परस्य हीदं प्रकरणम् ॥

स्थित्यदनाभ्यां च ॥ ६ ॥

"तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्योऽभिचाकशीति" इति जीवस्य कर्मफलादनमभिधायानश्नतो दीप्यमानस्य स्थित्यभिधानाच्चायं परमात्मा ॥

भूमाधिकरणम् २

भूमा संप्रसादादध्युपदेशात् ॥ ७ ॥

The context treats of the Highest Self. The text is this—'Then the higher knowledge is that by which the indestructible is apprehended' (*Mund.* I-1-5).

6. *Sthityadanābhyāṁ ca*

And on account of abiding and eating.

'One of them eats the sweet *Pippala* fruit, while the other shines without eating' (*Mund.* III-1-1.) In this scriptural text it is stated that the individual self enjoys the fruits of his actions, and the other shines in splendour without eating. Hence, the Highest Self is referred to in the context.

BHŪMĀDHIKARANA 2

7. *Bhūmā saṁprasādādadhyupadeśāt*

The *Bhūman* (is the Highest Self) as the instruction about Him is on His superiority than the individual self.

"सुखं त्वेव विजिज्ञासितव्यम्" "भूमैव सुखम्" इत्युक्त्वा भूम्नः स्वरूपमाह—"यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति नान्यच्छृणोति नान्यद्विजानाति स भूमा" इति । यस्मिन् सुखेऽनुभूयमाने तद्व्यतिरिक्तं किमपि सुखत्वेन न पश्यति, न शृणोति, न विजानाति, स भूमेत्युच्यते; "अथ यत्रान्यत्पश्यत्यन्यच्छृणोत्यन्यद्विजानाति तदल्पम्" इति वचनात् ॥

तथाच महाभारते—

"दिव्यानि कामचाराणि विमानानि सभास्तथा ।
आक्रीडा विविधा राजन् पद्मिन्यश्चामलोदकाः ॥
एते वै निरयास्तात स्थानस्य परमात्मनः" ॥

इति । "एष तु वा अतिवदति यः सत्येनातिवदति" इति प्रस्तुतं चाति-

The scriptures state—'The pleasure alone is to be inquired into' (*Chānd.* VII-22). 'The *Bhūman* alone is pleasure' (*Chānd.* VII-23). Then it narrates the nature of the *Bhūman* thus 'Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, knows nothing else, that is the *Bhūman*' (*Chānd.* VII-24). That is called *Bhūman*, while experiencing which pleasure one does not see anything else as pleasure, does not hear anything else as pleasure and does not know anything else as pleasure; because there is the scriptural text, 'But where one sees something else, hears something else, knows something else, that is the little' (*Chānd.* VII-24). In the *Mahā-Bhārata* it is stated thus —'The celestial heavenly chariots moving unrestrained, halls, the pleasure grove of various kinds and the lotus-pools of crystal water—All these, Oh dear, are hells when compared with that abode of the Highest Self' (*S'ā.* 196-4). 'But he is *Ativādīn* who makes a supreme declaration by the means of the Truth' (*Chānd.* III-16). The fact that he is Ativâdin

वादित्वमेवमेव समञ्जसम् । अतिवादित्वं हि स्वोपास्यपुरुषार्थाधिक्यवादित्वम् । तदल्पमित्यल्पप्रतियोगित्वेन भूमेत्युक्तप्रकारवैपुल्यविशिष्टसुखरूपवाची[1] । अयं भूमशब्दव्यपदिष्टः परमात्मा, संप्रसादादध्युपदेशात् । संप्रसादः प्रत्यगात्मा, "अथ य एष संप्रसादः" इत्यादिश्रुतेः । "एष तु वा अतिवदति यः सत्येन" इत्यादिना प्राणशब्दनिर्दिष्टात् प्रत्यगात्मन ऊर्ध्वमर्थान्तरत्वेनास्योपदेशात् ॥

धर्मोपपत्तेश्च ॥ ८ ॥

could be reasonably maintained only on the acceptance of this fact. The *Ativādin* (*i.e.* one, who speaks on High) is one, who is the object of his devotion, speaks of it as highly beneficial to man. The word *Bhūman*, that is the counter term of the 'little' speaks of the abundance of pleasure, possessed by Him as stated above. What is denoted by the word *Bhūman*, is the Highest Self, because the *Bhūman* is said greater than the individual self. The word, *Saṁprasāda* occuring in the *Sūtra* means the individual self. The scriptural text is this—'Then this is the (*Saṁprasāda*) individual self' (*Chānd.* VIII-3-4). Consider the text, 'But he is an *Ativādin*, who makes a supreme declaration by means of the Truth' (*Chānd.* III-16). What is taught here is the Person, who is different from and higher than the individual self, who is denoted by the word *Prāna*.

8. *Dharmopapatteśca*

On account of the attributes being suitable (to the Highest Self).

[1] स्वरूपवाचि, M 3.

"स भगवः कस्मिन् प्रतिष्ठितः ? स्वे महिम्नि" इत्यादावुपदिष्टानां स्वमहिमप्रतिष्ठितत्वसर्वकारणत्वसर्वात्मत्वादिधर्माणां परस्मिन्नेवोपपत्तेश्च भूमा परः ॥

अक्षराधिकरणम् ३

अक्षरमम्बरान्तधृतेः ॥ ९ ॥

"एतद्वै तदक्षरं गार्गि ब्राह्मणा अभिवदन्त्यस्थूलमनणु" इत्यादिनाभिहितमक्षरं परं ब्रह्म, अम्बरान्तधृतेः ; "[1]यदूर्ध्वं गार्गि दिवः" इत्यारभ्य

'Oh Blessed Sir, In whom does He rest? He rests in His own greatness' (*Chānd.* VII-24). From the above mentioned and other scriptures, the attributes, such as (1) resting in His own greatness (2) being the cause of the creation, etc. of the universe and (3) being the Self of all objects, are ascertained as belonging to the Highest Person. Hence the word *Bhūman*, refers to the Highest Person

AKSARĀDHIKARANA 3

9. *Akṣaramambarāntadhṛteḥ*

The Indestructible (is the Brahman), on account of His supporting that which is the end of Ambara (ether).

The scriptural text says thus—'O Gārgi, *Brāhmanas* call that Indestructible (Aksara). It is not gross, not of atomic size' (*Bṛh.* 3-8-8). Here what is denoted by the term 'Indestructible' is the Highest Brahman, because He is said to be the support of that which is the end (or the place of merging) of ether. The scriptural passage beginning with 'O Gārgi, which is above the sky' (*Bṛh.* 3-8-7) mentions the

[1] यदूर्ध्वं गार्गि दिव इत्यारभ्य omitted A 1.

सर्वविकाराधारतया निर्दिष्ट आकाशः कस्मिन्नोतश्च प्रोतश्चेति पृष्टे "एतद्वै तदक्षरम्" इति निर्दिष्टस्याक्षरस्य वायुमदम्बरान्तधृतेः। सर्वविकाराधारो ह्ययमाकाशो वायुमदम्बरान्तकारण प्रधानम्। तद्धारकं परं ब्रह्म ॥

सा च प्रशासनात् ॥ १० ॥

सा च धृतिः "एतस्य वाक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि" इत्यादिना प्रकृष्टाज्ञया क्रियमाणा श्रूयते। अत इदमक्षरं प्रत्यगात्मा च न भवतीत्यर्थः ॥

Ākāśa as the support of all changable things. It is again questioned 'In whome is this Ākāśa woven crosswise and lengthwise?' (*Bṛh* 3-8-7). In answering the above question the text 'This is the Indestructible (Aksara)' (*Bṛh.* 3-8-8) says that the Aksara is the support of that which is the end of Ambara (ether) contained with wind. The purport of the whole topic is this. The Ākāśa which is said to be the support of all changable things is identical with the ***Pradhāna*** or ***Avyakta***, the primitive cause and merging place of Ambara (the ether) pregnant with wind. The Aksara (Indestructible one) which is said to be the support of the ***Pradhāna*** is the ***Supreme Brahman.***

10. *Sā ca praśāsanāt*

And this (supporting springs) from command.

Such kind of support is said to have sprung from the supreme command, in the text, 'Oh! *Gārgi*! In the supreme command of the Indestructible, etc.' (*Bṛh.* 3-8-9). Hence this Indestructible cannot be the individual self as well,

अन्यभावव्यावृत्तेश्च ॥ ११ ॥

अन्यभावोऽन्यत्वम् । "अदृष्टं द्रष्टृ" इत्यादिना परमात्मनोऽन्यत्वं ह्यस्याक्षरस्य व्यावर्तयति वाक्यशेषः । अतश्च पर एव ॥

ईक्षतिकर्माधिकरणम् ४

ईक्षतिकर्म व्यपदेशात्सः ॥ १२ ॥

"यः पुनरेतं त्रिमात्रेणोमित्यनेनैवाक्षरेण परमपुरुषमभिध्यायीत" इत्यारभ्य "स एतस्माज्जीवघनात्परात्परं पुरिशयं पुरुषमीक्षते" इत्यत्र

11 *Anyabhāvavyāvṛtteśca*

And on account of the negation of being other than that (the Highest Self).

'Being other' means 'being different'. The further portion of the sentence 'The unseen Seer, the unheard Hearer' nagates the difference between the Akṣara and the Highest Self. Therefore He is the Highest One only.

ĪKSATIKARMĀDHIKARANA 4

12. *Īkṣatikarma vyapadeśāt saḥ*

He (the Highest Self) is the object of seeing, because there is declaration of His essential characteristics.

The scriptural passage beginning with 'But he, who meditates with this syllable, *Om*, of three *Mātrās* on the Highest Person,' and ending with 'he sees the Person dwelling in the castle and Higher than the high, greater

ध्यायतिपूर्वकेक्षतिकर्म स प्रशासिता परमात्मेत्यर्थः । उत्तरत्र "तमोंकारेणै-वायनेनान्वेति विद्वान् यत्तच्छान्तमजरममृतमभयं परं च" इति परम-पुरुषासाधारणधर्मव्यपदेशात् । "यत्तत्कवयो वेदयन्ते" इति तदीयस्थानस्य सूरिभिर्दृश्यत्वव्यपदेशाच्च ॥

दहराधिकरणम् ५

दहर उत्तरेभ्यः ॥ १३ ॥

"अथ यदिदमस्मिन् ब्रह्मपुरे दहरं पुण्डरीकं वेश्म दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तर आकाशस्तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यं तद्वाव विजिज्ञासितव्यम्" इत्यत्र दहरा-

than mortal living, beings' (*Pras'.* V-5). Here the object of perception preceeded by meditation, is that Ruler Highest Self. In the subsequent passage it is stated thus—'The wise, by the means of the syllable Om, reaches Him who is calm, not aged immortal and fearless' (*Pras'.* V-7). Here are mentioned the attributes, that are peculiar to the Highest Self. It is also because in the scriptural text, 'The wise sages know that' (*Pras'.* V-7), it has been pointed out that the sages see His place of resort, (*i.e.* Heaven).

DAHARĀDHIKARAṆA 5

13. *Dahara uttarebhyaḥ*

The subtle (ether) is the Brahman, on account of the subsequent statements.

The scriptural passage 'Now, what is in this city of *Brahman*, is an abode, a small lotus-flower. Whithin that is a small space. What is within that, should be searched for. Certainly that is what one should desire to know' (*Chānd.*

काशशब्दनिर्दिष्टः परमात्मा, उत्तरेभ्यो वाक्यगतेभ्यस्तदसाधारणधर्मेभ्यः। उत्तरत्र दहराकाशस्य सर्वाधारतयातिमहत्त्वमभिधाय "एतत् सत्यं ब्रह्मपुरम्" इति निर्दिश्य, अस्मिन् ब्रह्माख्यपुरे दहराकाशे कामाः समाहिता इत्युक्ते, कोऽयं दहराकाशः, के च कामा इत्यपेक्षायाम् "एष आत्मापहतपाप्मा" इत्यारभ्य "सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पः" इत्यन्तेन दहराकाश आत्मा, कामाश्चापहतपाप्मत्वादयस्तद्विशेषणभूता गुणा इति हि ज्ञापयति। "दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तर आकाशस्तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यम्" इत्यत्र दहराकाशस्तदन्तर्वर्ति च यत्, तदुभयमन्वेष्टव्यमित्युक्तमिति ज्ञायते। "अथ य इहात्मानमनुविद्य व्रजन्त्येतांश्च सत्यान् कामान्" इति हि व्यज्यते ॥

VIII-1-1). mentions the subtle ether. This subtle ether is the Highest Self, on account of the special attributes subsequently mentioned. In the subsequent passage, the subtle ether is said to be the support of all the worlds and hence to be of huge size It is also subsequently said that the city mentioned above is identical with the *Brahman* who is Truth and that in the subtle ether which is *Brahman-city* there are several desires (desirable attributes). Then there are inquiries as to what is this subtle ether and what are those desirable attributes. Then the following passage in answer begins with 'That is the Self, free from evil' and ends with 'whose wishes and purposes come true' (*Chānd.* 8-1-5). Here the subtle ether is the Highest Self. The desirable attributes are His freedom from evil etc. In the passage 'Within that is a small space. What is within that, should be searched for' (*Chānd.* 8-1-1) the subtle ether and the contents thereof are clearly mentioned to be searched for. This fact has been clearly indicated in the scriptural text 'Those who reach the Highest Place by meditating upon Him and His true qualities' (*Chānd.* 8-1-6).

गतिशब्दाभ्यां तथाहि दृष्टं लिङ्गं च ॥ १४ ॥

"एवमेवेमाः सर्वाः प्रजा अहरहर्गच्छन्त्य एतं ब्रह्मलोकं न विन्दन्ति" इत्यहरहः सर्वासां प्रजाना तमजानतीनां दहराकाशोपरि गतिर्वर्तनं[1], दहराकाशसमानाधिकरणो ब्रह्मलोकशब्दश्च दहराकाशः परं ब्रह्मेति ज्ञापयति। तथा ह्यन्यत्र सर्वासां प्रजानां परमात्मोपरि वर्तमानत्वं दृष्टम्—"तस्मिन् लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे" "तदक्षरे परमे प्रजाः" इत्यादौ। ब्रह्मलोकशब्दश्च "एष ब्रह्मलोकः" इत्यादौ। अन्यत्र दर्शनाभावेऽपीदमेव

14. *Gatıs'abdābhyām tathāhı dṛṣṭaṁ lıṅgaṁ ca*

On account of the movement above and of the word (*i.e.* the scriptural statements); for thus it is seen; and there is an inferential sign.

'Just so, all these people go to this *Brahman-world* everyday, but they do not know Him' (*Chānd.* VIII-3-2). This scriptural text says that every day all the people not knowing Him, move above the subtle ether *i.e.* they rest on Him. The word, *Brahma-loka* is used in the same grammatical equation with the *Ākās'a* of the subtle form. The above mentioned two facts help in determining that the subtle ether mentioned here, refers to the Highest *Brahman*. In the following scriptural statements also it is seen that all people take rest on the Highest Self. 'All these worlds take rest on Him' (*Kath.* II-6-1). 'The people take rest on the Highest Indestructible' (*Tait.* II-1-3). The word '*Brahma-loka*' is used to mean the Highest Person in the scriptural passage 'This is *Brahma-loka*' (*Bṛh.* IV-3-33). We need not go for any other external reference to prove this fact;

[1] वर्तमानत्व, A 2.

पर्याप्तमस्य परमात्मत्वे लिङ्गं, यद्दहराकाशोपरि सर्वस्य वर्तमानत्वं ब्रह्मलोक-शब्दश्च ॥

धृतेश्च महिम्नोऽस्यास्मिन्नुपलब्धेः ॥ १५ ॥

"अथ य आत्मा स सेतुर्विधृतिः" इति जगद्धृतेः परमात्मनो[1] महिम्नोऽस्मिन् दहराकाश उपलब्धेश्चायं परः । स हि परमात्ममहिमा, "एष सेतुर्विधरणः" इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥

प्रसिद्धेश्च ॥ १६ ॥

these above mentioned evidences alone *namely* that all people rest on the the subtle ether and the usage of the word *Brahma-loka* will suffice to prove it.

15. *Dhṛtesca mahimnosyāsminnupalabdheḥ*

And on account of the fact that the qualities supporting etc. that determine the greatness of the *Brahman*, are perceived in It.

That He is the support of the world is proved in scriptural text, 'Now, He, who is the Self, is the bank, a limitiary support' (*Chānd.* VIII-4-1). In this *Ākāśa* of a subtle form, are perceived the qualities that determine the greatness of the Highest Self, the support of the world. The qualities that determine the greatness of the Highest Self, are stated in the scriptural text, 'He is the bank and support etc' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-22).

16. *Prasiddhesca*

And on account of its meaning being established (in the scriptural texts).

[1] परमात्मनः सर्वस्य M. 3.

आकाशशब्दस्य "यदेष आकाश आनन्दः" इति परमात्मन्यपि प्रसिद्धेश्चायं परः । [1]सत्यसंकल्पत्वादिगुणबृन्दोपबृंहिता प्रसिद्धिर्भूताकाशप्रसिद्धेर्बलीयसीत्यर्थः ॥

इतरपरामर्शात्स इति चेन्नासंभवात् ॥ १७ ॥

"अथ य एष संप्रसादः" इतीतरस्य जीवस्य परामर्शात् प्रकृताकाशः स इति चेत्; नैतत्, उक्तगुणानां तत्रासंभवात् ॥

उत्तराच्चेदाविर्भूतस्वरूपस्तु ॥ १८ ॥

The word, *Ākās'a*, has been determined to mean the Highest Self in the scriptural text, 'This *Ākās'a* who is the Bliss etc.' (*Tait.* I-7-1) Hence it refers to the Highest Self. Therefore the word *Ākās'a* is more familiar in denoting the Highest Self endowed with the qualites such as true will etc. than the ether.

17. *Itaraparāmars'āt sa iti cennāsaṁbhavāt*

If it be said that on account of the reference to the other one, he (*i.e* the individual selt) is meant, we say in answer—No, on account of impossibility.

If it be said—The individual self is referred to in the scriptural text, 'Now, he the *Samprasāda* (*i.e.* the individual self)' (*Chānd.* VIII-3-4) and hence, this word *Ākās'a*, refers to the individual self, it is not so. The qualities mentioned therein are impossible in the individual self.

18. *Uttarāccedāvirbhūtasvarūpastu*

If it be said that from a subsequent passage (it appears that the individual self is meant); rather (the self) in so far as his true nature has become manifest.

[1] सत्यसंकल्पादि, M. 1.

उत्तरत्र "य आत्मापहतपाप्मा" इति जीवस्यापहतपाप्मत्वादिश्रवणान्नासंभवः। जागरितस्वप्नसुषुप्त्याद्यवस्थासु वर्तमानत्वात् स हि जीव इति चेत्; नैतत्, आविर्भूतस्वरूपस्तु। कर्मारब्धशरीरसंबन्धित्वेन[1] तिरोहितापहतपाप्मत्वादिकः, पश्चात् परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्याविर्भूतस्वरूपस्तत्रापहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणको जीवः प्रतिपादितः। दहराकाशस्त्वतिरोहितकल्याणगुणसागर इति नायं जीवः॥

अन्यार्थश्च परामर्शः॥ १९॥

In a subsequent passage, occurs the statement, 'This self free from evil' (*Chānd.* VIII-7-1). This passage refers to the indivudal self. Hence, impossibility of any kind does not here arise. Certainly, what is referred to in the context is the individual self, as he undergoes the states of wakefulness, dream, and deep sleep etc. It is not so. The statement relates to the individual self of whom the true nature has become manifest. The qualities, such as 'freedom from evil, etc.' are concealed by the association of the bodies, that are the products of *Karman* (past actions). When subsequently they (*i.e.* the released souls) reach the Highest Light, then, their true nature manifest themselves and they possess the qualities, such as, 'freedom from evil etc.' Such an individual self is mentioned in the text mentioned above. But the *Ākāśa* of the subtle form is mentioned as an ocean of many auspicious qualities, that could not be ever hidden. Hence, the word, *Ākāśa*, does not refer to the individual self.

19. *Anyārthaśca parāmarśaḥ*

And what is referred to (here) has a different purpose.

[1] संबन्धित्वेनावृततिरोहित, A 2, M 1.

"अस्माच्छरीरात् समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते" इति जीवात्मनो दहराकाशोपसंपत्त्या स्वरूपाविर्भावापादनरूपमाहात्म्यप्रतिपादनार्थोऽत्र जीवपरामर्शः ॥

अल्पश्रुतेरिति चेत्तदुक्तम् ॥ २० ॥

अल्पस्थानत्वस्वरूपाल्पत्वश्रुतेर्नायं परमात्मेति चेत्, तत्रोत्तरमुक्तम्—"निचाय्यत्वादेवं व्योमवच्च" इति ॥

अनुकृतेस्तस्य च ॥ २१ ॥

'The individual self, having left this body reaches the Highest Light and regains his own form' (*Chānd.* VIII-3-4). The above mentioned text states that the individual self regains his own nature when he reaches the Daharākāśa (the subtle ether). Thus the text refers to the Jīva, only for the purpose of explaining the power of the Highest Self in granting the individual self his essential nature.

20. *Alpaśruteriti cet taduktam*

If it be said that the scriptures declare that He is small; this objection has been replied already.

This is not the Highest Self, because the scriptures state that He occupies a small place and that by nature He is very small. Here the reply has been given already—'Because the *Brahman* has to be meditated upon in that manner, and because in the same passage the *Brahman* is said to be like ether' (*Sūtra.* I-2-7).

21. *Anukṛtestasya ca*

And on account of the imitation of the Highest Self by the individual self.

तस्य दहराकाशस्य परञ्ज्योतिषोऽनुकरणश्रवणाच्च[1] जीवस्य, न जीवो दहराकाशः। "स तत्र पर्येति जक्षत् क्रीडन् रममाणः" इत्यादिस्तदुपसंपत्त्या स्वच्छन्दवृत्तिरूपस्तदनुकारः श्रूयते ॥

अपि स्मर्यते ॥ २२ ॥

"इदं ज्ञानमुपाश्रित्य मम साधर्म्यमागताः ।
सर्गेऽपि नोपजायन्ते प्रलये न व्यथन्ति च" ॥

इति ॥

प्रमिताधिकरणम् ६

शब्दादेव प्रमितः ॥ २३ ॥

The individual self is said to imitate the Highest Light, who is the subtle *Ākas'a* (ether of the subtle kind). Therefore the individual self is not the *Ākās'a* of the subtle kind in question. Consider the scriptural text 'There he approaches Him eating, playing and rejoicing' (*Chānd.* VIII-12-3). It is stated here that, having approached Him, he imitates Him in acting as he desires.

22. *Api smaryate*

The same is declared by *smṛti* also.

It is stated in the *Smṛti* thus—'Those who, resort to this knowledge and attain the possession of qualities that characterise Me, are neither born at the time of creation, nor hurt at the time of dissolution' (*Bh. Gītā* XIV-2).

PRAMITADHIKARANA 6

23. *S'abdādeva pramitaḥ*

The measured one is the Highest Self, because of the term itself.

[1] अनुकारश्रवणाच्च, A 1.

"अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषो मध्य आत्मनि तिष्ठति। ईशानो भूतभव्यस्य" इत्यादावङ्गुष्ठप्रमितः परमात्मा, "ईशानो भूतभव्यस्य" इति सर्वेश्वरत्वशब्दादेव ॥

हृद्यपेक्षया तु मनुष्याधिकारत्वात् ॥ २४ ॥

अनवच्छिन्नस्याप्युपासकहृदि वर्तमानत्वापेक्षमङ्गुष्ठप्रमितत्वम्। मनुष्याणामेवोपासनसंभावनया तद्विषयत्वाच्च शास्त्रस्य मनुष्यहृदयापेक्षयेदमुक्तम्। स्थितं तावदुत्तरत्र समापयिष्यते ॥

देवताधिकरणम् ७

तदुपर्यपि बादरायणः संभवात् ॥ २५ ॥

'The person of the size of the thumb, stands in the middle of the self, as Lord of the past and the future' (*Kaṭh.* II-4-12). Here who is mentioned as measured by the size of the thumb, is the Highest Self, because of the use of the words, on His Lordship. 'The Lord of the past and the future'.

24. *Hṛdyapekṣayā tu manuṣyādhikāratvāt*

But the reference is to the heart, as the men are qualified (to meditate upon the Brahman.)

Even the Infinite One is mentioned as measured by the size of the thumb, because He remains in the heart of men, who meditate upon Him. Men alone are entitled to meditate upon Him. The scriptures are intended for men. Hence this is stated with reference to the heart of men. This topic will be finally concluded later on.

DEVATĀDHIKARANA 7

25. *Taduparyapi Bādarāyaṇaḥ saṁbhavāt*

Bādarāyaṇa thinks that, also those who are above men, meditate upon Him, because it is possible.

तद्ब्रह्मोपासनमुपरि देवादिष्वप्यस्ति, अर्थित्वसामर्थ्यसंभवादिति भगवान् बादरायणो मेने। संभवश्च पूर्वोपार्जितज्ञानाविस्मरणात्। मन्त्रार्थवादेषु विग्रहादिमत्तया स्तुतिदर्शनात्, तदुपपत्तये [1]तत्सद्भावात्तेषामेव प्रामाण्येन विग्रहादिमत्त्वाच्च ॥

विरोधः कर्मणीति चेन्नानेकप्रतिपत्तेर्दर्शनात् ॥ २६ ॥

विग्रहादिमत्त्व एकस्यानेकत्र युगपत्सांनिध्यायोगात् कर्मणि विरोध-इति चेत्; न, [2]शक्तिमत्सु सौभरिप्रभृतिषु युगपदनेकदेहप्रतिपत्तिदर्शनात् ॥

The illustrious *Bādarāyana* thinks thus—Even the gods, who are above men, meditate upon that *Brahman*, because they also are regarded as suppliants. Such a thing is possible for them, as they do not lose the memory of the knowledge, that they have acquired formerly. In the *Mantras* and *Arthavādas* of the *Veda*, the deities are praised as possessed with body. In order to justify the same, the existence of the body of gods should be accepted on the authority of the same *Vedic* passages.

26. *Virodhaḥ karmaṇīti cennānekapratipatterdarśanāt*

If it be said that it is opposed with reference to the ritual performances; we deny this, on account of the observation of the assumption of several bodies.

Suppose the gods have bodies. Then the individual god cannot be present at the same time in all places. Hence, there arises the contradiction as regards the ritual works. It is not so; because it is seen that *Saubhari* and others have assumed several bodies at the same time.

[1] तत्संभवे, A 1, तत्सत्त्वात् M 1. [2] शक्तिमत्सौभरि, M 1.

शब्द इति चेन्नातः प्रभवात्प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम् ॥ २७ ॥

वैदिके तु शब्दे विरोधप्रसक्तिः । देहस्य सावयवत्वेनोत्पत्तिमत्त्वादिन्द्रादिदेवोत्पत्तेः प्राग्विनाशादूर्ध्वं च [1]वैदिकेन्द्रादिशब्दानामर्थशून्यत्वमनित्यत्वं वा स्यादिति चेत्; न, अतः प्रभवात्; वैदिकादेवेन्द्रादिशब्दादिन्द्राद्यर्थसृष्टेः । न हीन्द्रादिशब्दा व्यक्तिवाचकाः; अपितु गवादिशब्दवदाकृतिवाचिनः । पूर्वस्मिन्निन्द्रादौ विनष्टे वैदिकेन्द्रादिशब्दादेव ब्रह्मा पूर्वेन्द्राद्याकृतिविशेषं स्मृत्वा, तदाकारमपरमिन्द्रादिकं कुलालादिरिव

27. *S'abda iti cennātah prabhavāt pratyakṣānumānābhyām*

If it be said (that a contradiction will occur) with regard to the words (*i.e.* scriptural statements); we say no, since beings originate from them (as appears) from perception and inference.

A contradiction will occur in the scriptural statements. Because the bodies of *Indra* and other gods are effected with several parts, they are not permanent. The *Vedic* words denoting *Indra*, etc. are totally devoid of meaning during the periods, which preceed the origination of *Indra* etc. or follow on their destruction. And also the *Veda* itself will be non-eternal. It is not so. The gods *Indra* etc. are created by the creator with the guidance given by the Vedic words *Indra* etc. The words, *Indra*, etc. do not mean any particular individual. But, as in the case of the words cow etc., they represent a class and species that bear the same form. Suppose the previous *Indra* is destroyed, then the four-faced *Brahman* remembers the particular form of *Indra*, etc. of former time and then

[1] वैदिक omitted A 1

घटादिकं सृजतीति न कश्चिद्विरोधः। कुत इदमवगम्यते? श्रुतिस्मृति-भ्याम्। श्रुतिस्तावत्—"वेदेन रूपे व्यकरोत्। सता सती प्रजापतिः" "स भूरिति व्याहरत्। स भूमिमसृजत" इत्यादिः। स्मृतिरपि—

"सर्वेषां तु स नामानि कर्माणि च पृथक् पृथक्।
वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ पृथक्संस्थाश्च निर्ममे" ॥

इत्यादिः ॥

अत एव च नित्यत्वम् ॥ २८ ॥

यतो ब्रह्मा वैदिकाच्छब्दादर्थान् स्मृत्वा सृजति, अत एव "मन्त्र-कृतो वृणीते" "विश्वामित्रस्य सूक्तं भवति" इति विश्वामित्रादीनां

creates new *Indra* etc. of the same form, like a potter makes a new pot. Hence, no contradiction will occur. How is this known? (Reply)—Such a thing is known from the statements found in Vedic scriptures and *Smṛtis*. The Vedic scriptural authority is this—'The creator created the *Sat* and *Asat* (the existent and non-existent things) by the guidance of *Veda*' (*Tait. Bṛ.* II-6-2.) 'He said '*Bhūḥ.*' Then he created the earth' (*Tait. Bṛ.* II-2-4). The *Smṛti* text is this—'In the beginning, he assigned the several names, actions and conditions, to all beings taking them from the words of the *Veda*' (*Manu Smṛti* I, 21) and so on.

28. *Ata eva ca nityatvam*

And for the same reason, the eternity of the *Vedas* is established.

The creator *Brahman* recollects the meaning of the words used in the *Vedas*. Then he creates the world. *Visvāmitra* and other sages are the composers of the *Mantras* as stated in the scriptural texts, 'He gratifies the composers of the *Mantras*', and 'This is the hymn of *Visvāmitra*'

मन्त्रादिकृत्त्वेऽपि मन्त्रादिमयवेदस्य नित्यत्वं तिष्ठति । अनधीतमन्त्रादिदर्शनशक्तान् पूर्वविश्वामित्रादींस्तत्तद्वैदिकशब्दैः स्मृत्वा तत्तदाकारानपरांस्तत्तच्छक्तियुक्तान् सृजति हि ब्रह्मा नैमित्तिकप्रलयानन्तरम् । ते चानधीत्यैव मन्त्रादीनस्खलितान् पठन्ति । अतस्तेषां मन्त्रादिकृत्त्वं वेदनित्यत्वं च स्थितम् ॥

प्राकृतप्रलये चतुर्मुखे वेदाख्यशब्दराशौ च विनष्टे कथं वेदस्य नित्यत्वमित्यत आह—

समाननामरूपत्वाच्चावृत्तावप्यविरोधो दर्शनात् स्मृतेश्च ॥ २९ ॥

(*Tait. Saṁ.* 5-2-3). Yet the *Vedas,* which are full of *Mantras,* etc. retain their eternity. He the creator remembers with the help of the words of the *Vedās Visvāmitra* and others of the former time, who are capable of repeating the *Mantras* without teaching Then he creates the persons having the same name and ability, who could recite the same *Mantras* assigned to them. This happens after the Naimittika Pralaya. These persons reveal the very *Mantras* etc. without any fault. Thus it is established that the *Vedas* are eternal and that the various persons mentioned therein are the authors of the various *Mantras*

How could then the eternity of the *Vedās* be established, when the *Vedās* and the creator are destroyed in the material deluge (*i.e.* Prākṛta Pralaya)? The *Sūtrakāra* answers this question thus:

29. *Samānanāmarūpatvāccāvṛttāvapyavirodho dars'anāt smṛtes'ca*

And on account of the sameness of the names and forms (in each creation of the world), no contradiction arises even in the subsequent creation; as it appears from *S'ruti* and *Smṛti* texts.

अत एव सृज्यानां समाननामरूपत्वात् प्राकृतप्रलयावृत्तावपि न विरोधः। आदिकर्ता परमपुरुषो हि पूर्वसंस्थानं जगत् स्मृत्वा तदाकारमेव जगत् सृजति। वेदांश्च पूर्वपूर्वानुपूर्वीविशिष्टानाविष्कृत्य चतुर्मुखाय ददातीति श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यामादिकर्ता पूर्ववत्सृजतीत्यवगम्यते। श्रुतिस्तावत् "सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत्" इत्यादिका। "यो ब्रह्माणं विदधाति पूर्वं यो वै वेदांश्च प्रहिणोति तस्मै" इति च। स्मृतिरपि—

"यथर्तुष्वृतुलिङ्गानि नानारूपाणि पर्यये।
दृश्यन्ते तानि तान्येव तथा भावा युगादिषु" ॥

इति।

The world, that is going to be created, will have the same name and form as it had formely. Hence, no contradiction arises, even if the material deluge does take place frequently. The Highest Person, who is the first creator of the world, recollects the form of the world, as it was before the deluge. Then He creates the world of the same form. Then He hands over to the creator the *Vedas*, which he remembers in the same order as it was before. It is known from *S'ruti* and *Smṛti* passages that the first creator created the world in the same form as it was before The *S'ruti* passages are these—'The creator *Brahman* created the sun and the moon as they were before' (*Tait.* II-1-38). 'He who created the creator in olden time and gave the *Vedas* to Him' (*S'vet.* VI-18).

The *Smrti* passage is this.—'As in each rotation, the various signs of the seasons are seen very same, so also is the case with various things in each *Yuga*'[1], etc. (*Viṣṇu* I-5-65).

[1] *Yuga* means the age of the world They are four—*Kṛta, Tretā, Dvāpara*, and *Kali*; the duration of each is said to be respectively, 1,728,000, 1,296,000, 864,000, and 432,000 years of men They together constitute a *Mahāyuga*.

इति। वेदस्य नित्यत्वं च पूर्वपूर्वोच्चारणक्रमविशिष्टस्यैव सर्वदोच्चार्यमाणत्वम्[1] ॥

मध्वधिकरणम् ८

मध्वादिष्वसंभवादनधिकारं जैमिनिः ॥ ३० ॥

मधुविद्यादिषु वस्वादिदेवानामेवोपास्यत्वात् प्राप्यत्वाच्च तत्र वस्वादीनां कर्मकर्तृभावविरोधेनोपास्यत्वासंभवात्, वसूनां [2]सतां वसुत्वं प्राप्तमिति प्राप्यत्वासंभवाच्च तत्र वस्वादीनामनधिकारं जैमिनिर्मेने ॥

Thus the eternity of the *Vedas* must be interpreted so as to mean that the words and sentences of the *Vedas* must be recited in the same order as found in traditional teaching.

MADHVADHIKARANA 8

30. *Madhvādiṣvasaṁbhavādanadhikāraṁ Gaiminiḥ*

Jaimini maintains that Vasu and other divine beings are not entitled to practise *Madhu* and other meditations (Vidyās) on account of the impossibility.

In the *Madhu* and other meditations, *Vasu* and other gods are to be meditated and they have to be attained, by resorting to those meditations. These gods cannot practise these meditations; because they cannot play at the same time the role of the agent and the object of the same meditation. More over *Vasus* cannot be the object of desire; because they are *Vasus* already. Therefore *Jaimini* maintains that, as they have not the necessary qualifications, they cannot resort to *Madhuvidyā* etc.

[1] उच्चार्यत्वम्, A 1, M 2. [2] सदा, M 1, 2.

ज्योतिषि भावाच्च ॥ ३१ ॥

"तं देवा ज्योतिषां ज्योतिरायुर्होपासतेऽमृतम्" इति ज्योतिषि परस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि देवानां साधारण्येन प्राप्तत्वेऽप्यधिकारभाववचनादन्यत्र वस्वाद्युपासनेऽनधिकारो न्यायसिद्धोऽवगम्यते ॥

भावं तु बादरायणोऽस्ति हि ॥ ३२ ॥

मधुविद्यादिष्वपि वस्वादीनामधिकारभावं भगवान् बादरायणो मन्यते । अस्ति हि वस्वादीनां सतां [1]स्वावस्थब्रह्मणं उपास्यत्वसंभवः,

31. *Jyotiṣı bhāvācca*

And this is on account of the meditation by the gods being directed towards Light.

'The *Devas* meditate upon Him, the Light of Lights, immortal and life' (*Br.* IV-4-16). Here the word Light, refers to the Highest *Brahman*. This passage refers to the meditation on the Highest Light by the gods. The meditation is already known as common to the gods and men. Yet this special reference indicates that the gods are entitled to do this particular meditation only and not other meditations involving *Vasu* and other gods as the object.

32. *Bhāvaṁ tu Bādarāyaṇostihı*

Bādarāyaṇa opines that (these qualifications) exist; for there is possibility (of such a contingency).

The blessed *Bādarāyaṇa* opines that *Vasu* and other gods possess the necessary qualifications for resorting to *Madhu* and other similar *Vidyās*. *Vasu* and others can

[1] सर्वावस्थ M 1.

[1]कल्पान्तरे वसुत्वादेः प्राप्यत्वसंभवश्च । "एकल एव मध्ये स्थाता" इत्यादिनादित्यस्य कारणावस्थां प्रतिपाद्य "य एतामेवं ब्रह्मोपनिषदं वेद" इति मधुविद्याया ब्रह्मविद्यात्वमाह । अतः कार्यकारणोभयावस्थं ब्रह्म तत्रोपास्यम् । कल्पान्तरे वस्वादित्वमनुभूयाधिकारावसाने ब्रह्मप्राप्तिर्न विरुद्धा ॥

अपशूद्राधिकरणम् ९

शुगस्य तदनादरश्रवणात्तदाद्रवणात् सूच्यते हि ॥ ३३ ॥

meditate upon the *Brahman* in their own form so that they may in future ages also hold the same position of their being *Vasu*. That the sun is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world is stated in the scriptural text, 'He stands in the middle alone' (*Chānd.* III-11-1). That the *Madhuvidyā* represents the knowledge of the *Brahman* is stated in the same context of the scriptural text, 'He, who knows thus this *Brahmopaniṣad*' (*Chānd.* III-11-3). Therefore, what is to be meditated upon there, is the *Brahman* in both the states of cause and effect. Thus no contradiction arises; because in a future age, they enjoy the position of *Vasu*, etc. and at the close of their office they attain the *Brahman*.

APASŪDRĀDHIKARAṆA 9

33. *S'ugasya tadanādaraṣravaṇāt tadādravaṇāt sūcyate hi*

(That) grief in him (arose), this is intimated by his resorting to him on hearing a disrespectful speech about himself.

[1] कल्पान्तरगत M 2.

"आजहारेमाः शूद्र" इत्यादौ ब्रह्मविद्योपदेशे शिष्यं प्रति शूद्रेत्यामन्त्रणेन शिष्यस्य ब्रह्मज्ञानाप्राप्त्या शुक् संजातेति सूच्यते। शोचनात् शूद्रः, न जातियोगेन। कुतः? तदनादरश्रवणात्। ब्रह्मविद्यावैकल्येन स्वात्मानं प्रति हंसोक्तानादरवाक्यश्रवणात्। तदैवाचार्यं प्रत्याद्रवणात्। हि-शब्दो हेतौ। यतः शूद्रेत्यामन्त्रणं न जातियोगेन, अतः शूद्रस्य ब्रह्मोपासनाधिकारो न सूच्यते ॥

क्षत्रियत्वगतेश्च ॥ ३४ ॥

The preceptor calls the disciple as '*S'ūdra*' at the time of imparting the knowledge of the *Brahman* as seen in the scriptural text, 'You have brought these, Oh *S'ūdra*' (*Chānd.* IV-2-5). It is here indicated that grief arose in the disciple, as he did not possess the knowledge of the *Brahman*. The word, '*S'ūdra*' etymologically means, 'one who grieves'. It does not mean him who belongs to the *S'ūdra* caste. Why? It is because of hearing a disrespectful speech. The phrase, 'on hearing a disrespectful speech about himself' means—on account of hearing a disrespectful speech about himself, who did not possess the knowledge of the *Brahman*. In consequence of that, he approached the preceptor. The word, '*hi*' used here refers to the cause that led *Jānas'ruti* to approach the preceptor. He was called *S'ūdra*, not on account his being born in that community. Therefore, it becomes clear that those, who are born in *S'ūdra* caste, are not entitled to practise the Brahmavidyā.

34. *Kṣatriyatvagates'ca*

And on account of *Jānas'ruti's Kṣatriya-hood* being recognised.

शुश्रूषोः क्षत्रियत्वावगतेश्च न जातियोगेन शूद्रेत्यामन्त्रणम्। उपक्रमे "बहुदायी" इत्यादिना दानपतित्वबहुपक्वान्नदायित्वबहुग्रामप्रदानैरस्य हि[1]क्षत्रियत्वं गम्यते ॥

उत्तरत्र चैत्ररथेन लिङ्गात् ॥ ३५ ॥

उपरिष्टाच्चास्यां [2]संवर्गविद्यायां ब्राह्मणक्षत्रिययोरेवान्वयो दृश्यते— "अथ ह शौनकं च कापेयमभिप्रतारिणं च" इत्यादौ। अभिप्रतारी हि चैत्ररथः क्षत्रियः। अभिप्रतारिणश्चैत्ररथत्वं क्षत्रियत्वं च कापेयसाहचर्या-

Because the disciple was recognized to be a *Ksatriya*, he was not addressed as a member of the *S'ūdra* community. In the beginning of the scriptural text, it is stated that he was the donor of many valuable things. Thus it becomes clear that he was a *Ksatriya*; because he made gift of many things, plentiful cooked rice and many villages.

35. *Uttaratra caitrarathena lingāt*

And on account of the inferential sign (occurring in the subsequent passage), namely, 'along with *Caitraratha*'.

Regarding this *Samvargavidyā* in a later passage it is seen that this *Vidyā* should be resorted to by *Brāhmaṇas* and *Ksatriyas* only. The scriptural text is this, 'Then *S'aunaka Kāpeya* and *Abhipratārin* etc.' (*Chānd.* IV-3-5). Now *Abhipratārin* is *Caitraratha* and a *Ksatriya.* That *Abhipratārin* was *Caitraratha* and also a *Ksatriya* is made known by that word being placed in juxtaposition with *Kāpeya.* In a different context, the characteristics

[1] हि omitted A 1, M 3. [2] संवर्ग omitted M 3.

लिङ्गादवगम्यते । प्रकरणान्तरे हि कापेयसहचारिणश्चैत्ररथत्वं क्षत्रियत्वं चावगतम्—"एतेन चैत्ररथं कापेया अयाजयन्" इति; "तस्माच्चैत्ररथो नामैकः क्षत्रपतिरजायत" इति च । अतश्चायं शिष्यो न चतुर्थः ॥

संस्कारपरामर्शात्तदभावाभिलापाच्च ॥ ३६ ॥

विद्योपक्रमे "उप त्वा नेष्ये" [1]इत्युपनयनपरामर्शात्, शूद्रस्य तदभावाभिलापाच्च न शूद्रस्य ब्रह्मविद्याधिकारः । "न शूद्रे पातकं किंचिन्न च संस्कारमर्हति" इति संस्कारो हि निषिद्धः ॥

of *Caitraratha* and also of a *Kṣatriya* are found in a person, who was associated with *Kāpeya*. The scriptural texts run as follow—'The *Kāpeyas* made *Caitraratha* perform the sacrifice' (*Tāṇd. Bṛ*. II-12-5). 'From him there was born the *Caitraratha* of *Kṣatriya* caste'. (*S'at. Bṛ*. II-5-3-13.) Therefore this disciple does not belong to the fourth caste.

36. *Saṁskāraparāmarsāt tadabhāvābhilāpācca*

On account of the reference to the ceremonial purifications and on account of the declaration of their absence.

In the beginning of the *Saṁvargavidyā*, it is stated thus, 'I will initiate you' (*Chānd.* IV-4-5). Here the ceremony of initiation called *Upanayana* is referred to. *S'ūdra* is not entitled to practise the *Brahmavidyā* or meditation on the *Brahman*, as there is declared the prohibition of such ceremony in his case. That he is excluded from the initiation of such ceremony is stated in *Manu* X-126 thus, 'In *S'ūdra* there is not any sin, and he is not fit for any ceremony'.

[1] इत्युपनयनसंस्कार M 2.

तदभावनिर्धारणे च प्रवृत्तेः ॥ ३७ ॥

"नैतदब्राह्मणो विवक्तुमर्हति समिधं सोम्याहर" इति शूद्रत्वाभावनिश्चय एवोपदेशप्रवृत्तेश्च नाधिकारः[1] ॥

श्रवणाध्ययनार्थप्रतिषेधात् ॥ ३८ ॥

शूद्रस्य हि श्रवणाध्ययनादीनि निषिध्यन्ते—"तस्माच्छूद्रसमीपे नाध्येतव्यम्" इति । अनुपशृण्वतोऽध्ययनादि च[2] न संभवति ॥

37. *Tadabhāvanırdhāraṇe ca pravṛtteḥ*

On account of the procedure, on determination of its absence.

The scriptural text—'A non-*Brāhmaṇa* pupil would not be able to tell thıs' (*Chānd.* IV-4-5) determınes that the descıple was not a *S'ūdra*. The teacher also proceeded to ımpart the *Vıdyā* to hım only on determınatıon of thıs fact. Hence *S'ūdras* do not possess the necessary qualıficatıons.

38. *S'ravaṇādhyayanārthapratıṣedhāt*

And on account of the prohibitıon of hearıng, studying, and learnıng the meanıng of the *Vedās*.

In the case of *S'ūdra*, hearing, studying etc. of the *Vedās* are prohıbıted under the rule—'Therefore the *Vedās* must not be studıed ın the presence of *S'ūdras*' The prohıbıtion of hearıng implıes the prohıbitıon of study also ın the case of *S'ūdras*.

[1] अनधिकारः M 3. [2] च omitted M 1,

स्मृतेश्च ॥ ३९ ॥

स्मर्यते हि शूद्रस्य वेदश्रवणादौ दण्डः । "अथ हास्य वेदमुपश्रृण्वतस्त्रपुजतुभ्यां श्रोत्रप्रतिपूरणमुदाहरणे जिह्वाच्छेदो धारणे शरीरभेदः" इति ॥

प्रमिताधिकरणशेषः

प्रासङ्गिकं परिसमाप्य प्रकृतमनुसरति—

कम्पनात् ॥ ४० ॥

अङ्गुष्ठप्रमितप्रकरणमध्ये "यदिदं किंच जगत्सर्वं प्राण एजति

39. *Smṛtesca*

And on account of *Smṛti* text.

The following *Smṛti* text prescribes the punishment for *S'ūdra* if he hears the *Veda* recited 'If *S'ūdra* hears the *Vedās* his ears have to be filled with lead and lac. If he repeats them, his tongue is to be cut. If he preserves them, his body is to be cut through' (*Gau. Dha.* 2-12-3).

APPENDIX TO THE PRAMITĀDHIKARANA

Having concluded the intervening topic, the *Sūtrakāra* continues the topic on hand—

40. *Kampanāt*

On account of trembling.

In the middle of the section dealing with the Person of the size of the thumb, it is stated—'whatever there is, the whole world, when gone forth, trembles from the Breath'

नि सृतम्" इत्यादिनाभिहिताङ्गुष्ठप्रमितप्राणशब्दनिर्दिष्टजनितभयात् वज्रादिवोद्यतादग्निवायुसूर्येन्द्रप्रभृतिकृत्स्नजगत्कम्पनादङ्गुष्ठप्रमितः परमपुरुष इति निश्चीयते ॥

ज्योतिर्दर्शनात् ॥ ४१ ॥

[1]तत्प्रकरणे "न तत्र सूर्यो भाति" इत्यारभ्य "तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति" इति भा शब्दाभिहितस्यानवधिकातिशयज्योतिषो दर्शनाच्चाङ्गुष्ठप्रमितः परमपुरुषः ॥

अर्थान्तरत्वादिव्यपदेशाधिकरणम् १०

आकाशोऽर्थान्तरत्वादिव्यपदेशात् ॥ ४२ ॥

(*Kath* II-3-2). The whole world including *Agni*, *Vāyu*, *Sūrya*, *Indra* and so on, trembles from great fear of Him, who is of the size of the thumb and who is denoted by the word, *Prāṇa*, as if the weapon *Vajra* is raised against it. Therefore the Person of the size of the thumb is determined to be the Highest Person.

41. *Jyotirdarśanāt*

On account of the brilliance being seen (used in the text).

The same context begins with, 'The sun does not shine there' and ends with, 'By his brilliance all this shines'. (*Kath.* II-2-15) Here what is denoted by the word, brilliance is the unsurpassable Light. Hence, the Person of the size of the thumb is the Highest Self.

ARTHĀNTARATVĀDIVYAPADEŚĀDHIKARAṆA 10

42. *Ākāśorthāntaratvādivyapadeśāt*

He is the *Ākāśa* (*i e.* Ether) as He is designated as being something different.

[1] अस्मिन्नेव प्रकरणे M 2.

"आकाशो ह वै नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद्ब्रह्म" इत्यादिना निर्दिष्ट आकाशः "धूत्वा शरीरम्[1]" इति प्रकृतात्प्रत्यगात्मनः परिशुद्धादर्थान्तरभूतः परमपुरुषः, नामरूपयोर्निर्वोढृत्वतदस्पर्शरूपार्थान्तरत्वामृतत्वादिव्यपदेशात् ॥

तत्त्वमस्यादिनैक्योपदेशात् प्रत्यगात्मनो नार्थान्तरभूतः परमपुरुष इत्याशङ्क्याह—

सुषुप्त्युत्क्रान्त्योर्भेदेन ॥ ४३ ॥

"प्राज्ञेनात्मना संपरिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किंचन वेद नान्तरम्" "प्राज्ञेनात्मनान्वारूढः" इति सुषुप्त्युत्क्रान्त्योर्बाह्यान्तरविषयानभिज्ञात्म-

'The Ether is the evolver of names and forms. He who is without these names and forms is *Brahman*,' (*Chānd.* VIII-14-1). This *Ākāśa* is the Highest Person, who is other than the pure self mentioned in the context, by the scriptural text, 'Having shaken off the body,' (*Chānd.* VIII-13-1) It is because He is designated as the evolver of names and forms and unconnected with them. He is also mentioned as endowed with the above-said attributes and immortality.

There is the teaching, 'That thou art' (*Chānd.* VI-8-7). Hence the individual self is not different from the Highest Self. This doubt is removed thus—

43. *Suṣuptyutkrāntyorbhedena*

On account of differences in deep sleep and departing.

'Embraced by the intelligent Self, he knows nothing that is without or within' (*Bṛh.* IV-3-21). 'Mounted by the intelligent Self' (*Bṛh.* IV-3-35). Thus it is seen that in the states of deep sleep and departing, the individual

[1] शरीरमकृतं कृतात्मा A 1.

स्यगात्मनस्तदानीमेव प्राज्ञतया भेदेन व्यपदेशादर्थान्तरभूत एव परः[1] ॥

पत्यादिशब्देभ्यः ॥ ४४ ॥

परिष्वज्जके प्राज्ञे श्रूयमाणेभ्यः पत्यादिशब्देभ्यश्चायमर्थान्तरभूतः। "सर्वस्याधिपतिः सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः" इति ह्युत्तरत्र श्रूयते। ऐक्योपदेशोऽपि "अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः" इत्यनेन जीवस्य शरीरभूतस्यात्मतयावस्थितेरिति स्वयमेव परिहरिष्यति ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे प्रथमस्याध्यायस्य तृतीयः पादः

---

self is ignorant of the external and internal world. But here the distinction manifests itself because the Highest Self is said to be intelligent. Hence this Highest Self is different from the individual self.

44. *Patyādis'abdebhyaḥ*

And on account of the use of the words, 'Lord' and so on.

The embracing intelligent Self is designated upon by the terms, Lord, etc. Hence He is other than the individual self. Subsequently this scriptural text occurs, 'He is the Lord of all, the overlord of all and the Ruler of all', (*Bṛh.* IV-4-22). The doubt about the identity of the individual self with the Brahman will be set aside in *the Sūtra* I-4-22 explaining the oneness due to the fact that He is the Self of these individual selves that are His body.

THUS ENDS THE 3RD PĀDA OF THE 1ST ADHYĀYA.

[1] परः omitted A 1, 2.

प्रथमाध्याये चतुर्थः पादः

आनुमानिकाधिकरणम् १

**आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपक-
विन्यस्तगृहीतेर्दर्शयति च ॥ १ ॥**

एकेषां कठानां शाखायामानुमानिकं प्रधानमपि जगत्कारणत्वेन "महतः परमव्यक्तम्" इत्युच्यत इति चेत्, न; पूर्वत्र "आत्मानं

ADHYĀYA I, PĀDA IV

ĀNUMĀNIKĀDHIKARAṆA 1

1. *Ānumānikamapyekeṣāmiti cenna, śarīrarūpaka-vinyastagṛhīterdarśayati ca*

If it be said that some (mention) that which is proved by inference (as the cause of the creation etc. of the world); we deny this, because (there is mention of the body in metaphor) and (the text) shows this.

In the scriptural text belonging to some of the *Vedic* seers (*i.e. Kaṭhas*) the *Pradhāna,* that could be proved by inference, is stated to be the cause of the world. The text is this—'Beyond *Mahat* is the *Avyakta* (or unmanifest *Prakṛti*' (*Kaṭh.* I-3-11). It is not so. The scriptural text,

रथिनं विद्धि" इत्यादिषूपासनोपायेषु वशीकार्यत्वाय रथिरथादिरूपकविन्यस्तेषु शरीराख्यरूपकविन्यस्तस्यात्राव्यक्तशब्देन गृहीतेः। "इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्थाः" इत्यादिना हि वशीकार्यत्वे परा उच्यन्ते। तथाचोत्तरत्र श्रुतिरेव दर्शयति—"यच्छेद्वाङ्मनसी प्राज्ञः" इत्यादिना॥

सूक्ष्मं तु तदर्हत्वात्॥ २॥

सूक्ष्ममव्यक्तमेव शरीरावस्थं कार्यार्हमित्यव्यक्तशब्देन शरीरमेव गृह्यते॥

यदि रूपकविन्यस्तानामेव ग्रहणं, किमर्थम् "अव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः" इति? अत आह—

'Know the self as riding in a chariot' (*Kath.* I-3-3) mentions in a metaphorical sense, the various means of meditation as the chariot-rider, chariot etc. in order to teach their control. There the body which is mentioned as chariot should be taken as meant by the word *Avyakta*. Consider the text, 'Higher than the senses are their objects etc.' (*Kaṭh.* I-3-10). Here the objects are mentioned as higher in the matter of control. The subsequent passage, *viz.* 'The intelligent should supprss his speech and mind' (*Kath.* I-3-13) teaches the same thing.

2. *Sūkṣmaṁ tu tadarhatvāt*

But the subtle is the body; on account of its capacity.

The *Avyakta* (*i.e.* the unevolved *Prakṛti*), that is of subtle state, assumes the state of the body, and is capable of entering into activities. Therefore the word, *Avyakta*, denotes the body.

If the things that are mentioned metaphorically are meant here, then why is it stated thus, 'Higher than the *Avyakta* is the Person' (*Kaṭh.* I-3-11)? The *Sūtrakāra* says in reply thus—

तदधीनत्वादर्थवत् ॥ ३ ॥

पुरुषाधीनत्वादात्मशरीरादिकमर्थवदुपासननिर्वृत्तये भवति । पुरुषो ह्यन्तर्यामी [1]सर्वमात्मादिकं प्रेरयन्नुपासनोपायत्वेन वशीकार्यकाष्ठा प्राप्यश्चेति "सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः" इत्युच्यते ॥

ज्ञेयत्वावचनाच्च ॥ ४ ॥

अत्राव्यक्तस्य ज्ञेयत्वावचनाच्च न कापिलमव्यक्तम् ॥

3. *Tadadhīnatvādarthavat*

Matter in its subtle state subserves an end, on account of its dependence on Him (*viz.* the Supreme Person).

The individual selves and the body etc. are dependent on the Highest Person. Hence they serve the purpose of helping for the perfection of the meditation. Indeed the Highest Person, being Inner Ruler, directs all the individual selves, etc. for the meditation. Hence He is one of the means of the meditation and occupies the foremost place of those that must be brought under influence. He is also reachable by the meditators. The scripture states thus, 'He occupies the highest place. He is the Highest course' (*Kaṭh.* I-3-11).

4. *Jñeyatvāvacanācca*

And on account of the absence of statement of its being an object of knowledge.

There are no statements to prove that the *Avyakta* (*i.e.* unevolved *Prakṛti*) is an object of knowledge. Hence it cannot be the *Avyakta* of Kapila's School.

[1] सर्वात्मादिकं M 1, M 3.

वदतीति चेन्न, प्राज्ञो हि प्रकरणात् ॥ ५ ॥

"अशब्दमस्पर्शम्" इत्यारभ्य "निचाय्य तम्[1]" इति वदतीति चेत्; न; "तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम्" "एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढोत्मा न प्रकाशते" इत्यादिना प्रकृतः प्राज्ञो हि "निचाय्य तम्" इति ज्ञेय उच्यते ॥

त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च ॥ ६ ॥

उपास्योपासनोपासकानां त्रयाणामेवास्मिन् प्रकरणे ज्ञेयत्वेनोपन्यासः .

5. *Vadatīti cenna, prājño hi prakaraṇāt*

Should it be said that the text declares it to be known; we say, not so, because the Intelligent Self is referred to in the context.

If it be said that the scriptural text beginning with 'It is without sound, without touch' and ending with 'knowing it.' (*Kath.* I-3-15) declares that *Avyakta* is the object of knowledge, it is not so. The intelligent Self is referred to in the scriptural text 'Knowing Him' who is read in the context of the passage 'That Highest place of *Visnu*' (*Kaṭh.* I-3-9). 'This Self is hidden in all beings and does not shine forth' (*Kath.* I-3-12).

6. *Trayāṇāmeva caivamupanyāsaḥ praśnaśca*

And of three only, there is the mention in this way and also the question.

In the *Upaniṣad* under discussion there is the mention, in the form of questions and answers, of only three things, *viz.* the object of the meditation, the nature of the meditation

[1] तम् omitted M 2.

प्रश्नश्च ; न प्रधानादेः । "अध्यात्मयोगाधिगमेन देवं मत्वा" इत्यादिरुपन्यासः । "येयं प्रेते विचिकित्सा मनुष्ये अस्तीत्येके" इत्यादिकश्च प्रश्नः ॥

महद्वच्च ॥ ७ ॥

"बुद्धेरात्मा महान् परः" इत्यात्मशब्दाद्यथा न तान्त्रिको महान्, तथाऽव्यक्तमपीति ॥

चमसाधिकरणम् २

चमसवदविशेषात् ॥ ८ ॥

and the person engaged in the meditation. But there is no mention at all of the *Pradhāna* etc. The mention is this—' They know the Lord through knowledge of the self, obtained with concentrated mind' (*Kath.* I-2-12). The question is this, ' Some say that there is something after death, some say no' (*Kath.* I-1-20).

7. Mahadvacca

And as in the case of the *Mahat.*

'Higher than the intellect is the great self' (*Kaṭh.* I-3-10). Here the word, *Mahān,* refers not to the *Mahat* of the *Sāṁkhyas* because the usage of the word Ātman. Similarly, their *Avyakta* also should not be taken as meant.

CAMASĀDHIKARAṆA 2

8. *Camasavadaviśeṣāt*

On account of there being no mention of the special characteristic; as in the case of *Camasa.*[1]

[1] Camasa is a cup used in the sacrifice for drinking *Soma* juice.

"अजामेकां लोहितशुक्लकृष्णां बह्वीः प्रजाः सृजमानाम्" इत्यत्र न तन्त्रसिद्धा प्रकृतिः कारणत्वेनोक्ता। जन्माभावयोगमात्रेण न तस्या एव प्रतीतिः, "अर्वाग्बिलश्चमसः" इतिवत् प्रकरणे विशेषकाभावात्। यथा "इदं तच्छिरः" इति हि चमसो विशेष्यते। यौगिकशब्दाद्विशेष-प्रतीतिर्हि विशेषकापेक्षा॥

ज्योतिरुपक्रमा तु तथा ह्यधीयत एके॥ ९॥

ज्योतिर्ब्रह्म। ज्योतिरुपक्रमा[1] ब्रह्मकारणिकेयमजा। तथाहि ब्रह्म-

The scriptural text 'The unborn one, red, white and black who produces many creatures' (*S'vet.* IV-5) does not state that the *Prakṛti* of the *Sāmkhyas* is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world. It cannot be said, that on consideration of the derivative meaning, *viz.* the absence of birth, the *Prakṛti* alone is understood here, because in this context, the word *Ajā* has not been used in any particular sense, as in the case of the word *Camasa* used in the text, 'The *Camasa* with downward mouth' (*Bṛh.* II-2-3). Here the word *Camasa*, is used in a special sense. The scriptural text in support of this is this—'It is the head' (*Bṛh.* II-2-3). The apprehension of a particular thing by a derivative word is due to the mention of its qualifying attributes.

9. *Jyotirupakramā tu tathāhyadhīyata eke*

It (*Prakṛti*) has the light for its origin, for thus some read in their text.

The word 'light' means 'the *Brahman*'. That means that this *Ajā* (*i.e. Prakṛti*) has the *Brahman* for its origin.

[1] ज्योतिरुपक्रमा omitted A 1, M 1.

कारणिकाया एव प्रतिपादकमेतत्सरूपं मन्त्रं च तैत्तिरीया अधीयते । "अणोरणीयान्महतो महीयान्" इत्यारभ्य "अतः समुद्रा गिरयश्च" इत्यादिना सर्वस्य ब्रह्मण उत्पत्त्या तदात्मकत्वप्रतिपादनसमये "अजामेकाम्" इति पठन्ति । अतस्तत्प्रत्यभिज्ञानादियं ब्रह्मकारणिकेति निश्चीयते ॥

कल्पनोपदेशाच्च मध्वादिवदविरोधः ॥ १० ॥

कल्पना सृष्टिः । यथा "सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत्" इति[1] । "अस्मान्मायी सृजते विश्वमेतत्" इत्यादिना सृष्ट्युपदेशादजात्व-

The *Taittirīyas* read in their text that the *Ajā* had the *Brahman* for its cause. The text begins with 'smaller than the small, greater than the great, etc.' (*Taiṭ*. II-10-1) and ends with, 'From Him the seas and the mountains etc.' (*Tait*. II-10 3). This proves that everything is born from the *Brahman* and has the *Brahman* for its self. In the context of the elucidation of this truth they read the text 'The unborn one etc.' (*Taiṭ*. II-10-5). Therefore it is decided that *Brahman* is the cause of the *Prakṛti*, because of the remembrance of the teaching mentioned above.

10. *Kalpanopades'ācca madhvādivadavirodhaḥ*

And on account of the teaching of the *Kalpanā* (*i.e.* creation), there is no contradiction as in the case of the *Madhuvidyā*.

'*Kalpanā*' means 'creation'. It is so stated in the scriptural text, 'The creator created the sun and the moon as they were before' (*Tait*. II-1-38). The creation of the *Prakṛti* has been taught in the text, 'The Lord of wonderful power created this universe out of this' (*S'vet*. IV-9). Therefore no contradiction arises in *Pradhāna's* being unborn and also

[1] इति omitted A 1, M 3. *Taiṭ*. Grantha edition followed.

ब्रह्मकार्यत्वयोरविरोधः । अविरोधश्च प्रलयकाले नामरूपे विहायाचिद्वस्त्वपि सूक्ष्मरूपेण ब्रह्मशरीरतया तिष्ठतीत्यजात्वम् । सृष्टिकाले नामरूपे भजमाना प्रकृतिर्ब्रह्मकारणिका । यथा आदित्यस्य सृष्टिकाले वस्वादिभोग्यरसाधारतया मधुत्वं कार्यत्वं च । तस्यैव प्रलयकाले मध्वादिव्यपदेशानर्हसूक्ष्मरूपेणावस्थानमकार्यत्वं च मधुविद्यायां प्रतीयते "असौ वा आदित्यो देवमधु" "नैवोदेता नास्तमेता, एकल एव मध्ये स्थाता" इति । तद्वत् ॥

संख्योपसंग्रहाधिकरणम् ३

न संख्योपसंग्रहादपि नानाभावादतिरेकाच्च ॥ ११ ॥

being produced by the *Brahman.* The non-sentient beings, at the time of the deluge, give up name and form and remain as the body of the *Brahman.* They are called unborn in that stage. At the time of creation they take name and form and hence they are caused by the *Brahman.* Consider the following example—In the *Madhuvidyā* it is stated that the sun, at the time of creation, assumes the state of 'honey' and also the state of effect, as he becomes the seat of those objects, that are pleasing to the taste of *Vasu*, etc. At the time of deluge, he assumes a subtle form, that cannot be indicated as 'honey' and he does not assume the state of effect. The scriptural texts in support of this are—

(*a*) 'Verily the Sun, is the honey of the gods' (*Chānd*, III-1-1).

(*b*) 'He does not rise, neither does He set. He remains alone in the middle' (*Chānd.* III-11-1).

SAMKHYOPASAMGRAHĀDHIKARAṆA 3

11. *Na saṁkhyopasaṁgrahādapi nānābhāvādatirekācca*

Not from the mention of the number even (could it be the *Prakṛti*); because it is stated that He (assumes) many forms and that He is other than (the *Prakṛti*).

"यस्मिन् पञ्च पञ्चजनाः" इत्यत्र पञ्चविंशतिसंख्योपसंग्रहादपि न तान्त्रिकाण्येतानि, यस्मिन्निति यच्छब्दनिर्दिष्टब्रह्माधारतया तेभ्यः पृथग्भावात् । एतेषां तत्त्वातिरेकाच्च । यच्छब्दनिर्दिष्टमाकाशश्चेति द्वयमतिरिक्तम् । संख्योपसंग्रहादपीत्यपिशब्दान्नात्र पञ्चविंशतिसंख्यासग्रहः । "दिक्संख्ये संज्ञायाम्" इति संज्ञाविषयोऽयं पञ्चजना इति । पञ्चजना नाम केचित् । ते पञ्चेति पञ्च पञ्चजना इत्युच्यते ; सप्त सप्तर्षय इतिवत् ॥

प्राणादयो वाक्यशेषात् ॥ १२॥

'He, on whom the five Five-things etc.' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-17). Here it may be argued that the *Prakṛti* is meant, because there is a reference to its modification into twenty-five kinds; however the *Prakṛti* is not meant here. The words, 'On Him indicate that He is the support of that *Prakṛti* and is different from that *Prakṛti*. He belongs to a different category over and above the twenty-five categories. The objects denoted by the words, 'He' and '*Ākāśa*' are different from the twenty-five varieties of *Prakṛti*. The word 'even' used in 'from the mention of the number even' indicates that the number twenty-five is not meant here. The word '*Pañcajana*' denotes a class of things known by the name of *Pañcajana*. *Pāṇini* states—'The words denoting direction and number are compounded with nouns provided the compound-word denotes the name of a thing' (*Pāṇini*, II-1-50). This is similar to the statement, 'Seven seven-sages.'

12. *Prāṇādayo vākyaśeṣāt*

The word, *Pañcajana*, refers to the breath, etc. on the ground of the complementary passage.

पञ्चजनसंज्ञिताः प्राणादयः पञ्चेन्द्रियाणीति "प्राणस्य प्राणमुत चक्षुषश्चक्षुः" इत्यादिवाक्यशेषादवगम्यते । चक्षुःश्रोत्रसाहचर्यात्प्राणान्न-शब्दावपि स्पर्शनादीन्द्रियविषयौ ॥

ज्योतिषैकेषामसत्यन्ने ॥ १३ ॥

एकेषां शाखिनां काण्वानाम्, "अन्नस्यान्नम्" इत्यसति, "तं देवा ज्योतिषां ज्योतिः" इत्युपक्रमगतेन ज्योतिःशब्देन पञ्च पञ्चजना इन्द्रियाणीति ज्ञायन्ते । ज्योतिषां ज्योतिः प्रकाशकानां प्रकाशकं ब्रह्मेत्युक्त्वा, अनन्तरं "पञ्च पञ्चजनाः" [1]इत्युक्तेस्ते प्रकाशकानि पञ्चेन्द्रियाणीति गम्यते ॥

We see from a complementary passage, *viz.* 'They who know the breath of the breath, the eye of the eye, etc.' (*Mādhyaṁdina-S'ākhā*) that the five things are the breath, etc. Because they are used in juxtaposition with the words eye and the ear, the words 'breath' and 'the food' denote the organs of touch etc.

13. *Jyotiṣaikeṣāmasatyanne*

In the text of some, the word light (*i.e. Jyotis*) indicates the five sense-organs, even though the word, food is not (used in their text).

In the text of the *Kāṇvās*, the words, 'food of the food' are not used. But they begin with the statement, 'Him the gods worship as the light of the lights' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-16). Here the word, 'light' used in the context along with the five five-things refers to the sense-organs. The words 'The light of lights' mean the *Brahman* who is the Illuminator of illuminators. Then the words, 'the five five-things' are introduced. Hence, by the word, '*Pañcajana*' we understand the five organs.

[1] इत्युक्ते A 1, M 1.

कारणत्वाधिकरणम् ४

कारणत्वेन चाकाशादिषु यथाव्यपदिष्टोक्तेः ॥ १४ ॥

आकाशादिषु कार्यवर्गेषु कारणत्वेन सर्वत्र वेदान्तवाक्येषु[1] "असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्" "तद्धेदं तर्ह्यव्याकृतमासीत्" इत्यादिष्वनिर्ज्ञातविशेषेषु "आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्। स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजै" इति विशेषवाचिवाक्यनिर्दिष्टस्यैवोक्तेर्न तान्त्रिकाव्याकृतादिकारणवादप्रसङ्गः ॥

समाकर्षात् ॥ १५ ॥

KĀRAṆATVĀDHIKARAṆA 4

14. *Kāraṇatvena cākāśādiṣu yathāvyapadiṣṭokteḥ*

And on account of (the *Brahman*) as described being declared to be the cause of the ether etc.

In all the *Vedānta* passages the *Pradhāna* has not been declared to be the cause of ether, etc :—' Verily the *Asat* was in the beginning' (*Taiṭ.* I-7-1). 'Then, indeed, this remained undifferentiated' (*Bṛh.* I-4-7). Here the special characteristics of the cause are not apprehended. But the special characteristics of the cause are apprehended in the scriptural text, 'The Self alone was in the beginning.' It thought, 'may I creat the worlds' (*Ait.* I-1). Hence it does not arise that *Prakṛti* etc. of the *Sāṁkhya* school, should be the cause of the creation.

15. *Samākarṣāt*

On account of bringing down (from another passage).

[1] कारणवाक्येषु M 3.

"सोऽकामयत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इति पूर्वनिर्दिष्टस्यैव सर्वज्ञस्य "असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्" इत्यत्र समाकर्षाच्च स एवेति गम्यते। "तद्धेदं तर्ह्यव्याकृतमासीत्" इति निर्दिष्टस्यैव "स एष इह प्रविष्ट आ नखाग्रेभ्यः" "पश्यत्यचक्षुः" इत्यत्र समाकर्षादेष एवाव्याकृतशब्दनिर्दिष्ट[1] इति निश्चीयते। असदव्याकृतशब्दौ तदानीं नामरूपविभागाभावादुपपद्येते॥

जगद्वाचित्वाधिकरणम् ५

जगद्वाचित्वात्॥ १६॥

"ब्रह्म ते ब्रवाणि" इत्युपक्रम्य "यो वै बालाक, एतेषां पुरुषाणां

The scriptural text 'He thought may I become many' (*Taiṭ.* I-6-2) mentions the All-knowing *Brahman*. The same word denoting the *Brahman* is brought down in interpreting the text 'Verily the *Asat* was in the beginning' (*Tait.* I-7-1). Therefore He alone is meant here In the same manner the text. 'Then, indeed, this remained *Avyākṛta* (Undifferentiated)' (*Bṛh.* I-4-7) mentioned the *Brahman.* The same word is brought down in interpreting the text 'He enteredin here, even to the fingernail-tips' (*Bṛh.* I-4-7) and 'He sees without eyes' (*S'vet.* III-19). The words *Asat* (non-existing) and *Avyākṛta* (Undifferentiated) have to be explained to mean Him, who has neither name nor form at the beginning.

JAGADVĀCITVĀDHIKARAṆA 5

16. *Jagadvācitvāt*

Because it denotes the world.

The scriptural text begins with, 'Let me tell you about the *Brahman*' (*Kauṣ.* III-4). and ends with, 'Oh Bālāki, He,

[1] एवाव्याकृत इति A 1, M 1. *Kauṣ.* Grantha edition followed.

कर्ता यस्य वैतत्कर्म स वै वेदितव्यः" इत्यत्र कर्मशब्दस्यैतच्छब्दसामानाधिकरण्येन क्रियत इति व्युत्पत्त्या जगद्वाचित्वात् परमेव ब्रह्म वेदितव्यतयोपदिष्टम् ॥

जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्नेति चेत् तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥ १७ ॥

"एतैरात्मभिर्भुङ्क्ते" "अथास्मिन् प्राण एवैकधा भवति" इति च [1]जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्न पर इति चेत्, एतत् प्रतर्दनविद्यायामेव परिहृतम्।

who is the maker of these persons and to whom this work belongs, He, indeed, is to be known' (*Kaus.* III-26). Here the word, 'work' which is used in the same grammatical equation with the word, 'this' refers to the world, as it is said to be the product. Therefore what is taught here is that the Highest *Brahman* should be known.

17. *Jīvamukhyaprāṇaliṅgānneti cet tadvyākhyātam*

Should it be said that this is not so, on account of the distinguishing characteristics of the individual selves and of the Chief vital breath (*i.e. Prāṇa*) mentioned therein; we reply, that this has been explained before.

In the scriptural texts, 'He enjoys with the individual selves' (*Kauṣ.* III-44) and 'Then with this *Prāṇa* alone, he becomes one' (*Kauṣ.* III-39), the Highest is not referred to; because there are stated only the distinguishing characteristics of the individual selves and Prāṇa. This objection has already been answered in the chapter dealing with the *Pratardanavidyā*. In consideration of the context, it has

[1] जीवादि M 2, 3.

पूर्वापरपर्यालोचनया ब्रह्मपरत्वे निश्चिते, तदनुगुणतया नेयमन्यल्लिङ्गमिति ॥

**अन्यार्थं तु जैमिनिः प्रश्नव्याख्यानाभ्या-
मपिचैवमेके ॥ १८ ॥**

"तौ ह सुप्तं पुरुषमाजग्मतुः" इत्यादिना देहातिरिक्तजीवसद्भाव-प्रतिपादनं,[1] तदतिरिक्तपरमात्मसद्भावज्ञापनार्थमिति "क्वैष एतद्बालाके पुरुषोऽशयिष्ट" इति प्रश्नात्, "अथास्मिन् प्राण एवैकधा भवति" इति

been determined that the *Brahman* is meant here. Therefore, other characteristics should be explained in consonance with the fact already established.

18. *Anyārthaṁ tu Jaiminiḥ praśnavyākhyā-
nābhyāmapi caivameke*

But Jaimini thinks that it has another purpose, on account of the question and answer; and thus some also say.

That the individual selves are other than the body has been stated in the scriptural text, 'They two, approached the person, who was asleep' (*Bṛh.* II-1-15). This statement is intended to teach that the Highest Self is other than the individual selves. This fact has been proved by the question and answer found in other scriptural text. The question is this—'Where, O Bālāki, did this person sleep?' (*Kauṣ.* III-35) The answer—'Then he becomes one with this *Prāna*'. (*Kauṣ.* III-39). This answer bears the same idea

[1] प्रतिबोधनं A 1, M 2.

"सता सोम्य तदा संपन्नो भवति" इति वाक्यसमानार्थकात् प्रतिवचनाच्चावगम्यते । एके वाजसनेयिनोऽपि, [1]एतत्प्रश्नप्रतिवचनसमानार्थं[2] वाक्यं स्पष्टमधीयते च—"क्वैष तदा" इत्यादि "य एषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशस्तस्मिञ्छेते" इत्यन्तम् ॥

वाक्यान्वयाधिकरणम् ६

वाक्यान्वयात् ॥ १९ ॥

"न वा अरे पत्युः कामाय पतिः प्रियो भवत्यात्मनस्तु कामाय" इत्यारभ्य, "आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः" इत्यादिनोपदिष्टः परमात्मा;

as contained in the text 'My dear, then he has reached the Being' (*Chānd.* VI-8-1). Some (*i.e. Vājasaneyins*) recite the passage bearing the same meaning as contained in the question and answer given above. It begins with 'where then was this person' (*Bṛh.* II-1-16) and closes with, 'He sleeps in *Ākāśa*, that is encased in the heart' (*Bṛh.* II-1-17).

VĀKYĀNVAYĀDHIKARAṆA 6

19. *Vākyānvayāt*

On account of the sentences giving a connected meaning.

What is taught in the scriptural passage, beginning with 'Verily, a husband is dear, not for the love of the husband, but for the love of the Self' and ending with 'The Self, my dear, is to be seen, etc.' (*Bṛh.* II-4-5) is the Highest Self.

[1] प्रश्न omitted M 1, 2. [2] सरूपं A 1, M 3.

"अमृतत्वस्य तु नाशास्ति वित्तेन" इत्यारभ्य, "आत्मनि खल्वरे दृष्टे श्रुते मते विज्ञात इदं सर्वं विदितम्" इत्यादेः "येनेदं सर्वं विजानाति" इत्यन्तस्य कृत्स्नस्य वाक्यस्य परमात्मन्येवान्वयात् ॥

अस्मिन्प्रकरणे प्रकरणान्तरे च जीववाचिशब्देन परमात्मनोऽभिधाने तत्सामानाधिकरण्ये च कारणं मतान्तरेणाह—

प्रतिज्ञासिद्धेर्लिङ्गमाश्मरथ्यः ॥ २० ॥

"आत्मनि खल्वरे दृष्टे" इत्यादिना परमात्मज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञान-

There is a reference to the Highest Self in the text, beginning with 'For immortality, however, there is no hope through the wealth.' (*Bṛh.* II-4-2) and concluding with 'when the Self is seen, hearkened, thought on and understood, then all this is known' (*Bṛh.* IV-5-6) and 'By means of which one understands all this' (*Bṛh.* IV-5-15). All these sentences are with reference to the Highest Self.

In this context and also in other context the words denoting Jiva mean the Highest Self and are used in grammatical equation with the word denoting Him The *Sūtrakāra* gives the reason for this according to the different views in the following *Sūtras*—

20. *Pratijñāsiddherliṅgamāśmarathyaḥ*

It is a mark indicating that the proposition under discussion is proved. Thus *Āśmarathya* thinks.

The Highest Self is meant here, in order to establish the proposition, *namely*, 'All this will become known through the knowledge of the Highest Self' as stated in the

प्रतिज्ञासिद्धये जीवस्य तत्कार्यतया तस्मादनतिरिक्तत्वं ज्ञापयितुं जीवशब्देन परमात्माभिधानमित्याश्मरथ्यः ॥

उत्क्रमिष्यत एवंभावादित्यौडुलोमिः ॥ २१ ॥

उत्क्रमिष्यतो मुक्तस्य परमात्मस्वरूपभावादात्मशब्देन परमात्माभिधानमित्यौडुलोमिः ॥

अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः ॥ २२ ॥

"य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोऽन्तरः" इत्यादिना [1]जीवात्मनि

scriptural text—'when the Self is seen etc.' (*Bṛh.* IV-5-6). ***Āśmarathya*** opines that the Highest Self is denoted by the words referring to *Jīva* in order to bring to our remembrance the fact, that the *Jīvas* are not different from the Highest Self, as they are effected by Him.

21. *Utkramiṣyata evambhāvādityaudulomiḥ*

Because the individual selves, when they depart, possess the characteristics of the Highest Self; thus ***Auḍulomi*** thinks.

Auḍulomi thinks that the word referring to the 'self' denotes 'the Highest Self'; because the *Mukta* (*i.e.* the released soul) possesses the characteristics of the Highest Self.

22. *Avasthiteriti Kāśakṛtsnaḥ*

On account of the Brahman's abiding within the individual self; thus *Kāśakṛtsna* thinks.

The teacher, *Kāśakṛtsna*, thinks that the Highest Self is the self of the individual selves as stated in the text—'He, who

[1] जीवात्मनः A 1, M 3.

[1]परमात्मन आत्मतयावस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्न आचार्यो मन्यते[2] । इदमेव मतं सूत्रकारः स्वीकृतवानिति मतद्वयमुपन्यस्य तद्विरोध्येतदभिधानादन्यस्यानभिधानाच्च निश्चीयते ॥

प्रकृत्यधिकरणम् ७

प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् ॥ २३ ॥

जगदुपादानकारणमपि[3] परं ब्रह्म, न निमित्तमात्रम्; "स्तब्धोऽस्युत तमादेशमप्राक्ष्यो येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवति" इति येनादेष्ट्रा निमित्तभूतेन

remaining within the self, controls the self' (*Bṛh.* III-7-22. *Mādhy.*) It is understood that the *Sūtrakāra* has accepted this view because after stating the views of the two schools mentioned above, he introduced this view in refutation of those views. Moreover he has not stated any other view in refutation of this view. Hence it is decided that it must be the view of the *Sūtrakāra.*

PRAKṚTYADHIKARAṆA 7

23. *Prakṛtiśca pratijñādṛṣṭāntānuparodhāt*

The Brahman is the material cause also on account of this truth not being in conflict with the proposition under discussion and the illustrative example.

The Highest *Brahman* is also the material cause of the world. He is not the instrumental cause alone. The scriptural text says thus—'You are proud. Did you ever ask about the Ruler (*i.e. Ādeśa*) by hearing whom the unheard becomes heard?' (*Chānd.* VI-1-3). It means 'By the knowledge of Him, who is the Ruler, all this world of sentient and non-sentient beings

[1] परमात्मनः omitted A 1, M 3. [2] मेने A 1, M 3.
[3] अपि omitted M 1.

विज्ञातेन चेतनाचेतनात्मकं कृत्स्नं जगद्विज्ञातं भवतीत्यादेष्टृविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानप्रतिज्ञातदुपपादनरूपमृत्कार्यदृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् । आदिश्यतेऽनेनेत्यादेशः । [1]आदेशशब्देनादेष्टाभिधीयते । आदेशः प्रशासनम्; "एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि" इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥

अभिध्योपदेशाच्च ॥ २४ ॥

"तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इति निमित्तभूतस्येक्षितुर्विचित्रचिदचिद्रूपजगदाकारेणात्मनो बहुभवनसंकल्पोपदेशाच्चोपादानमपीति विज्ञायते ॥

become known.' The proposition is this—'All this will become known, if the Universal Ruler is known'. The illustrative example here is the clay. The above mentioned truth should be accepted so that the said proposition and the example may not be contradicted. The word *Ādes'a* used in the text denotes the Ruler; because it means Him by whom the world is ruled over. Thus the word, *Ādes'a*, means the Ruling Person. The scriptural text in support of this is thus—'O Gārgi, at the command of that imperishable etc.' (*Bṛh.* III-8-9).

24. *Abhidhyopadeṣācca*

Because also of the statement of His thought.

He thought 'may I become many' (*Chānd.* VI-2-3). This scriptural text proves that the Person, who possesses the character of thinking and who is the instrumental cause, transformd Himself into the form of the world, consisting of various sentient and non-sentient beings through His will. Hence, it is known that He is the material cause also of the world.

[1] इत्यादेश A 1, M 1.

साक्षाच्चोभयाम्नानात् ॥ २५ ॥

"ब्रह्म वनं ब्रह्म स वृक्ष आसीत्" "ब्रह्माध्यतिष्ठद्भुवनानि धारयन्" इत्युपादानं निमित्तं च ब्रह्मैवेति [1]स्वशब्देनोभयाम्नानाच्च ॥

आत्मकृतेः ॥ २६ ॥

"सोऽकामयत" इति निमित्तभूतस्य[2] स्वस्यैव जगदाकारेण कृतेः "तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत" इत्युपदिश्यमानायाः परमपुरुषो जगन्निमित्तमुपादानं चेति विज्ञायते ॥

25. *Sākṣāccobhayāmnānāt*

And on account of both being directly declared in the scriptures.

'The *Brahman* is the wood. That *Brahman* became the tree. The *Brahman* stood supporting the worlds' (*Tait. Br.* II-8-9). This scriptural text shows that the *Brahman* is both the instrumental cause and the material cause of the world. This fact has been declared in distinct word in the scriptural text.

26. *Ātmakṛteḥ*

On account of the statements as regards the Self transforming.

The text, 'He desired' (*Taiṭ.* I-2-6-2) shows that He is the instrumental cause. Again the text 'That Self created Himself.' (*Tait.* 1-2-7-1) shows that He made Himself in the form of the world. From these statements it is understood that the Highest Self is known to be both the instrumental cause and the material cause of the world.

[1] स्व omitted M 2. [2] निमित्तस्य A 1.

परस्य ब्रह्मणो निरवद्यत्वसत्यसंकल्पत्वादेस्तद्विपरीतानन्तापुरुषार्थाश्रय-जगदाकारेणात्मकृतेश्चाविरोधः कथमित्याशङ्क्याह—

परिणामात् ॥ २७ ॥

अत्रोपदिश्यमानात् परिणामात् तदविरोध एव। अविभक्तनाम-रूपातिसूक्ष्मचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकः कारणावस्थः परमपुरुषः स्वयमेव "सोऽकामयत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इति विभक्तनामरूपचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरको भवेयमिति

The stainlessness and the true will are known to be characteristics of the Highest Self. He is again said to have created Himself into the form of the world, which is the seat of endless evils that are opposed to the above-mentioned characteristics and unfit to be the ambitions of men. How can this contradiction be averted? The author of the *Sūtras* answers this question thus—

27. *Pariṇāmāt*

It is so owing to the modification.

No contradiction arises, as the scriptural text here teaches the modification. The Highest Person in the causal state has as His body the sentient and non-sentient beings in a subtle state, that cannot be distinguished with distinct name and form. He wills then that the sentient and non-sentient beings, that are His body, should have distinct names and forms. Then He separates from Himself all the sentient and non-sentient beings, that constitute His body in a subtle state. The scriptural authority is this He desired 'May I become many' (*Taiṭ*. I-2-6-2) 'He created all this' (*Taiṭ*. I-2-6-2). He entered the sentient and non-sentient beings that constitute His

संकल्प्य, "इदं सर्वमसृजत। यदिदं किंच" इति स्वशरीरभूतमतिसूक्ष्मं चिदचिद्वस्तु स्वस्माद्विभज्य, "तत् सृष्ट्वा। तदेवानुप्राविशत्" इति स्वस्माद्विभक्ते चिदचिद्वस्तुनि स्वयमेवात्मतयानुप्रविश्य,[1] "सच्च त्यच्चाभवत्। निरुक्तं चानिरुक्तं च। निलयनं चानिलयनं च। विज्ञानं चाविज्ञानं च। सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यमभवत्" इति हि स्वस्य बहुभवनरूपपरिणाम उपदिश्यते। अतो न कश्चिद्विरोधः। अविभागावस्थायामपि जीवस्तत्कर्म च सूक्ष्मरूपेण तिष्ठतीति वक्ष्यति—"न कर्माविभागादिति चेन्न, अनादित्वादुपपद्यते चाप्युपलभ्यते च" इति ॥

योनिश्च हि गीयते ॥ २८ ॥

"यद्भूतयोनिम्" इत्यादिषु योनिश्च गीयते। अतश्चोपादानमपि ॥

body in the subtle state also and that are different from Him. This is stated thus—'Having created it, He entered it'. (*Tait.* I-2-6-2). Then the scriptural text teaches that He has transformed Himself into many forms 'He became *Sat* and *Tyat*, defined and undefined, based and non-based, conscious and unconscious, real and unreal; yet He remained as real' (*Tait* I-2-6-1). The above-mentioned texts teach that He took the modification into many forms. Therefore no contradiction arises. Even in the state of non-distinction the individual selves and their actions are in a subtle state. So states *Brahma-sūtra* II-1-35.

28. *Yoniśca hi gīyate*

He is sung as constituting the source also.

He is also called the source in the text—'The wise perceive Him as the source of beings' (*Muṇḍ.* I-1-6). Therefore He is the material cause also.

[1] अनु omitted M 2.

सर्वव्याख्यानाधिकरणम् ८

एतेन सर्वे व्याख्याता व्याख्याताः ॥ २९ ॥

"जन्माद्यस्य यतः" इत्यादिनैतदन्तेन न्यायेन सर्वे वेदान्ता ब्रह्मपरा व्याख्याताः । द्विरुक्तिरध्यायपरिसमाप्तिद्योतनाय ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे प्रथमस्याध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः

समाप्तश्चाध्यायः

SARVAVYĀKHYĀNĀDHIKARAṆA 8

29. *Eténa sarve vyākhyāta vyākhyātaḥ*

Thus all the texts have been commented upon, have been commented upon.

By these lines of arguments set forth from the second *Sūtra* to the end of this chapter, it has been proved that all the *Vedānta* passages refer to the Highest Brahman. The repetition indicates that the chapter is closed.

THUS ENDS THE 4TH PĀDA OF THE 1ST ADHYĀYA.

द्वितीयाध्याये प्रथमः पादः

स्मृत्यधिकरणम् १

स्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्ग इति चेन्न, अन्यस्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्गात् ॥ १ ॥

उपबृंहणापेक्षे वेदान्तार्थनिर्णये[1] सति, कपिलस्मृत्युपबृंहणेन वेदान्तार्थः प्रधानकारणवाद इत्यनभ्युपगमे कपिलस्मृतेरुपबृंहणानन्वयेनानवकाशप्रसक्ति-

ADHYĀYA II, PĀDA I

SMRTYADHIKARAṆA 1

1. *Smṛtyanavakāśadoṣaprasaṅga iti cenna, anya-smṛtyanavakāśadoṣaprasaṅgāt*

If it be said that there would result the fault of being no room for certain *Smṛti*; (we reply) 'no'; because there would result the fault of want of room for other *Smṛtis*.

There is the desire to look into other texts for support in order to determine the meaning of the *Vedānta* passages. Accordingly *Vedānta* passages, by the support of the *Kapila-Smṛti*, must determine the *Prakṛti* to be the cause of the

[1] निश्चये A 1, M 2.

रिति चेत्; न, अन्यासां [1]वेदान्ताविरोधिनीनां बह्वीनां मन्वादिस्मृतीनामनवकाशप्रसक्तेः। वेदस्योपबृंहणापेक्षत्वेऽप्यनन्यपराविरुद्धानेकस्मृतिषु सतीषु, विरुद्धाया[2] वेदोदितार्थविशदीकरत्वाभावेन[3] तस्या उपबृंहणत्वमन्याय्यमित्यर्थः ॥

योगीन्द्रकपिलस्य तथानुपलब्धेः कथं स्मृत्यन्तरं न्याय्यमिति चेत्, तत्राह—

इतरेषां चानुपलब्धेः ॥ २ ॥

creation, etc. of the world. If this is not accepted this *Kapila-Smṛti* cannot be a supporting text. Hence, there can be no any purpose of that particular *Smṛti* text. It is not so; because it results there being no room for other *Smṛtis*, *Manu-Smṛti*, etc., that are not opposed to the *Vedānta*. It is true that the *Vedic* texts require *Smṛti* works for support [4]; however when there are many other *Smṛti* works agreeable to the *Vedic* texts, the *Smṛti* that is opposed to the *Veda*, cannot be considered as the work for support.

But *Kapila*, the greatest of the sages, does not accept that doctrine of the other *Smṛtis*. How then is it right to say that other *Smṛtis* are the works of support? The answer is this—

2. *Itareṣām cānupalabdheḥ*

And because the others have not accepted the doctrine of *Kapila*.

[1] वेदाविरोधिनीनां A 1. [2] विरुद्धार्थाया: A 1. [3] विशदीकरणत्वाभावेन M 1, 2.

[4] *Vide*, "पुराणैरितिहासैश्च वेदं समुपबृंहयेत्।
बिभेत्यल्पश्रुताद्वेदो मामयं प्रतरेदिति ॥"

वेदार्थसाक्षात्कारचतुरमन्वादियोगीन्द्राणां कपिलदृष्टार्थानुपलब्धेः कपिलोपलब्धिर्भ्रम[1] एव ॥

योगप्रत्युक्त्यधिकरणम् २

एतेन योगः प्रत्युक्तः ॥ ३ ॥

योगस्य हैरण्यगर्भस्यापि कापिलस्मृतिवद्वेदविरुद्धत्वाविशेषात् तद्वन्निरासः ॥

विलक्षणत्वाधिकरणम् ३

न विलक्षणत्वादस्य; तथात्वं च शब्दात् ॥ ४ ॥

The greatest of the sages, *Manu* and others, were capable of directly perceiving the meaning of the *Vedās*. They have not apprehended the principle as suggested by *Kapila*. Therefore, what *Kapila* apprehended was an error.

YOGAPRATYUKTYADHIKARANA 2

3. *Etena yogaḥ pratyuktaḥ*

By this line of argument, the Yoga system is refuted.

The Yoga system taught by *Hiraṇyagarbha* is opposed to the *Vedas*, in the same way as the *Kapila-Smṛti* is opposed. Hence this also is refuted, by following the same line of argument.

VILAKSAṆATVĀDHIKARAṆA 3

4. *Na vilakṣaṇatvādasya; tathātvaṁ ca s'abdāt*

On account of the difference of character, the world cannot be the effect produced by the *Brahman* and that the world being such, appears from scriptures.

[1] भ्रान्तिमूलेव A 1.

विकारास्पदत्वेनाज्ञत्वेनापुरुषार्थाश्रयत्वेन च जगतो ब्रह्मविलक्षणत्वात् तत्कार्यत्वं न संभवति। विलक्षणत्वं[1] शब्दाच्चावगम्यते, "विज्ञानं चाविज्ञानं च" इत्यादेः ॥

अभिमानिव्यपदेशस्तु विशेषानुगतिभ्याम् ॥ ५ ॥

"तं पृथिव्यब्रवीत्" "आपो वा अकामयन्त" [2]इत्यादिज्ञानकार्यव्यपदेशस्तदभिमानिदेवताविषय इति, "हन्ताहमिमास्तिस्रो देवताः" इति देवताशब्देन विशेषितत्वात् "अग्निर्वाग्भूत्वा मुखं प्राविशत्" इत्यादिना तत्तदचिद्वस्त्वभिमानित्वेन देवतानुगतेश्चावगम्यते ॥

The world possesses the character of undergoing the changes of states. It is ignorant and the seat of evils which are not fit to be in the scope of desire of men. Hence on account of the difference of character, the world cannot be the effect of the *Brahman*. That there is difference in character between the two, is established in the text, 'knowledge and non-knowledge etc' (*Taiṭ.* 1-2-6-3).

5. *Abhimānivyapadeśastu viśeṣānugatibhyām*

But there is the denotation of the superintending deities; on account of distinction and entering.

'To him the earth said' (*Taiṭ. Saṁ.* V-5-2) 'The water desired' (*Taiṭ. Br.* III-1-5). From these texts it is seen that the earth, etc., had certain functions which were possible only for those, endowed with knowledge. However it should be explained that the functions were of the presiding divinities, because the word, divinities, is used in the text to qualify them, 'Alas! Let me enter these three divinities' (*Chānd.* VI-3-2). The divinities that preside over the

[1] विलक्षणत्वं च M 1, M 3. [2] इत्यादौ M 1.

दृश्यते तु ॥ ६ ॥

विलक्षणयोरपि कार्यकारणभावः संभवति, माक्षिकादिभ्यः क्रिम्याद्युत्पत्तिदर्शनात् ॥

असदिति चेन्न, प्रतिषेधमात्रत्वात् ॥ ७ ॥

एवं तर्हि कारणे कार्यमसदिति चेन्न, सालक्षण्यनियमप्रतिषेधमात्रत्वात् । पूर्वोक्तं कार्यकारणयोर्वस्त्वैक्यं न त्यक्तम् ॥

non-intelligent substances, are apprehended in the text, '*Agni*, having become speech, entered the mouth' (*Ait.* II-4).

6. *Drṣyate tu*

But it is seen (that the cause and the effect are of different characteristics).

It does happen that substances of different character, also assume the states of being the cause and effect. It is seen that insects etc. are produced from honey etc.

7. *Asaditi cenna, pratiṣedamātratvāt*

If it be said that the effect is non-existing; we say no, because there being a mere denial.

Then it is said that the effect is not present in the cause. This is not so; because what is denied here is the rule, *namely*, that the cause and the effect must possess the same characteristics. But the cause and the effect of the type do not renounce the character of being one substance as stated above.

अपीतौ तद्वत्प्रसङ्गादसमञ्जसम् ॥ ८ ॥

जगतो ब्रह्मणा[1] वस्त्वैक्येन तस्मिन्नपीत्यादौ जगत इव ब्रह्मणोऽपि विकारित्वाद्यनिष्टप्रसङ्गात् वेदान्तवाक्यं सर्वमसमञ्जसं स्यात् ॥

न तु, दृष्टान्तभावात् ॥ ९ ॥

नैतत्, "यस्यात्मा शरीरम्" "यस्याव्यक्तं शरीरम्" इत्यादि-श्रुतिसिद्धचिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकस्य ब्रह्मणः कार्यकारणभावेनावस्थाने गुणदोष-व्यवस्थितौ दृष्टान्तसद्भावात्। यथा जीवस्य सशरीरस्य मनुष्याद्यात्मनो

8. *Apītau tadvatprasangādasamañjasam*

On account of similar consequences in absorption, the *Vedānta* texts would be inappropriate.

As the *Brahman* and the world constitute one substance, it happens, that the *Brahman*, like the world, must undergo modification during the absorption of the world in Him. Therefore all the *Vedāntic* texts become inappropriate.

9. *Na tu, dṛṣṭāntabhāvāt*

Not so; as there are parallel instances.

It is not so. That the *Brahman* has, as his body, all the sentient and non-sentient beings has been proved in the scriptural texts, 'To whom the self is the body' (*Bṛh.* V-7-22 *Mādhya*) 'To whom the *Avyakta* (the unevolved matter) is he body' (*Sub.* 7). There are instances to show that good and bad qualities exclusively belong to Him and His body, while He remains in the state of both the cause and the effect. The illustrative example is this:—'The man, in whose body

[1] ब्रह्मणा कारणेन M 3.

बालत्वयुवत्वस्थविरत्वादिभावेऽपि बालत्वादयः शरीरे तिष्ठन्ति, ज्ञानसुखादयश्चात्मन्येव, तद्वदत्रापि शरीरभूतचिदचिद्वस्तुगतान्यज्ञानविकारादीनि[1] । आत्मभूते तु ब्रह्मणि निरवद्यत्वाविकारित्वसर्वज्ञत्वसत्यसंकल्पत्वादयः[2] ॥

स्वपक्षदोषाच्च ॥ १० ॥

प्रधानकारणवादे दोषाच्चायमेव ग्राह्यः । प्रधानकारणवादे निर्विकारपुरुषसंनिधानात् प्रकृतिप्रवृत्तावितरेतरधर्माध्यासादयो दुरुपपादाः । अन्य-

is encased the individual self, undergoes the changes of childhood, youth, and old age etc.' The childhood, youth etc. are the characteristics of the body. The pleasure, knowledge, etc. stick on to the self alone. In the same way the ignorance, different modifications etc. belong to the sentient and non-sentient beings, that constitute His body. The *Brahman*, who is the self of these sentient and non-sentient beings, is faultless and all-knowing. He does not undergo changes and possesses true will.

10. *Svapakṣadoṣācca*

And on account of objections to one's own view, (*i.e.* of the *Sāṁkhya* system).

The *Vedāntic* view alone has to be accepted, as there are faults in the *Sāmkhya* view that accepts the *Pradhāna* as the cause of the creation etc. of the world. In the school, that accepts *Pradhāna* to be the cause of the creation, etc. of the world, it is stated thus—' The *Pradhāna* undergoes changes in the presence of the *Purusa*, who always remain immutable'. Hence, it is not possible to explain the superimposition of the attributes of one object upon the

[1] दोषाः added A 1, M 2, Pr. [2] गुणाः added A 1, M 2.

त्रान्यधर्मानुसंधानरूपोऽध्यासो निर्विकारपुरुषस्य न संभवति । अचेतनायाः प्रकृतेरनुसंधानरूपोऽध्यासः सुतरां न संभवति ॥

तर्काप्रतिष्ठानादपि ॥ ११ ॥

प्रधानकारणवादस्य कुतर्कमूलत्वेन[1] तस्याप्रतिष्ठितत्वादपि त्याज्यं प्रधानम् ॥

अन्यथानुमेयमिति चेत्, एवमप्यनिर्मोक्षप्रसङ्गः ॥ १२ ॥

other in this case'. In the case of the immutable *Puruṣa*, the supposition of the attributes, that do not belong to him, does not take place. It is utterly impossible to hold the superimposition of the attributes of the *Puruṣa*, by the *Pradhāna* which is non-intelligent.

11. *Tarkāpratiṣṭhānādapi*

And in consequence of the unfoundedness of the reasoning (*i.e.* the reasoning advanced by the *Sāṁkhyas*).

The argument, *namely*, 'The *Pradhāna* is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world' is based on wrong reasoning. The reasoning has not been firmly founded on good basis. Hence, the *Pradhāna* should not be held as the cause of the creation etc. of the world.

12. *Anyathānumeyamiti cet, evamapyanirmokṣa-prasaṅgaḥ*

Should it be said that a different method of inference has to be advanced for proving that *Pradhāna* is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world; we reply that thus also it follows that the objection raised cannot be got rid of.

[1] मूलत्वात् M 3.

यदि चिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकत्वेन ब्रह्मणोऽपि सशरीरत्वमिष्यते, तर्हि जीववत् सशरीरत्वेन ब्रह्मणोऽपि शरीरसंबन्धप्रयुक्तसुखदु:खभोक्तृत्वापत्ते-र्जीवादविभागप्रसक्तिरिति[1] चेत्; न । स्यादेव जीवाद्विभागो निरवद्यत्व[2]-कल्याणगुणाकरत्वेन[3] ब्रह्मणः । न हि सशरीरत्वप्रयुक्तमनिष्टभोक्तृत्वम्; अपित्वन्यवश्यत्वकृतम् । यथा[4] लोके राज्ञः सशरीरत्वेऽप्यनन्यवश्यस्य[5] स्वाज्ञातिवृत्तिकृतानिष्टभोक्तृत्वं नेतरसमानम् ॥

If it is desired that the *Brahman* should be the corporeal Self, because all the sentient and the non-sentient beings constitute His body, then it happens that the *Brahman* enjoys pleasure and pain, just as the individual self; and because He has a body, there should not be any distinction between the individual self and the Highest Self. It is not so. The *Brahman* is surely distinct from the individual self, as He possesses a host of auspicious qualities bereft of in-auspicious ones. The experience of unliked things is not due to the connection with the body; but it is due to the fact of being dependant on others. In the world it is seen that the ruler, who is independent, has a body, but does not enjoy the fruits of the violation of his orders as his dependants are compelled to undergo the punishment.

[1] अविभागः प्रसक्त इति M 2. [2] निरवद्यत्वेन M 2.

[3] निरवद्यत्वसहितकल्याणगुणाकरत्वेनेति मध्यमपदलोपी समासः । यथा चामरद्वयं पार्श्वयोर्वीज्यमानं सम्राजश्चिह्नं तथोभयमपीदमविनाभूतं ब्रह्मणो लिङ्गमिति 'उभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि' इति सूत्रकारवचनादवगम्यते । अतएवोभयोः समस्तपदेनात्र निर्देशः । चरमसूत्र-भाष्ये तथा गीताभाष्ये च 'निखिलहेयप्रत्यनीककल्याणैकतानः' इति समस्तपदेनैवोभयो-र्निर्देशः कृतोऽवगन्तव्यः ।

[4] यथा omitted A 1. [5] अनन्यवश्यत्वात् M 2.

आरम्भणाधिकरणम् ६

तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः ॥ १५ ॥

कारणभूताद्ब्रह्मणोऽनन्यत्वं कार्यभूतस्य जगतो वाचारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यो वाक्येभ्योऽवगम्यते—"वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्" "सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्" "तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति" "ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्" "तत्त्वमसि" इत्यादिभ्यः ॥

भावे चोपलब्धेः ॥ १६ ॥

ĀRAMBHANĀDHIKARANA 6

15. *Tadananyatvamārambhaṇaśabdādibhyaḥ*

The non-difference of the world from that *Brahman* follows from the scriptural statement that begins with the word, *Ārambaṇa*.

The world which is caused by the *Brahman* is not different from its cause *Brahman*. This has been understood by the scriptural text dealing with His assumption of various modifications and having different names for the sake of worldly transactions through the verbal references. The scriptural texts quoted as authority here are—' A clod of clay undergoes changes by assuming different names for the worldly activities through the verbal references; Yet clod of clay only is true ' (*Chānd.* VI-1-4.) ' Existence alone, my dear, was in the beginning one only without a second.' "It thought, ' may I become many ' (*Chānd.* VI-2-1). ' All things that exist have Him as the Self ; ' and ' That thou art, Oh S'vetaketu '," (*Chānd.* VI-8-7).

16. *Bhāve copalabdheḥ*

And because, the cause is recognised in the state of the effect.

घटादिकार्यभावे च 'तदेवेदं मृद्द्रव्यम्' इत्युपलब्धेश्च कारणादनन्यत्कार्यम् ॥

सत्त्वाच्चापरस्य ॥ १७ ॥

कार्यस्य कारणे सत्त्वाच्च तस्मादनन्यत्कार्यम् । 'घटशरावादिकं पूर्वं मृदेवासीत्' इति हि घटादिर्मृदात्मनोपलभ्यते ॥ .

असद्व्यपदेशान्नेति चेन्न, धर्मान्तरेण वाक्यशेषाद्युक्तेः शब्दान्तराच्च ॥ १८ ॥

"इदं वा अग्रे नैव किंचनासीत्" इति कार्यस्य तदानीमसत्त्व-

In the state of the effect, such as pot etc., there is recognised its cause, thus, 'This is the same that substance *i.e.* clod of clay'. Therefore the effect is not different from the cause.

17. *Sattvāccecāparasya*

And on accont of the existence of the other (*i.e.* the effect).

The effect exists in the cause. Hence, it is not different from the cause. That the pot or plate had at a former moment the shape of a clod of clay is generally experienced. Therefore pot, etc. are apprehended to be the modifications of a clod of clay.

18. *Asadvyapades'ānneti cenna, dharmāntareṇa vākyas'eṣād yukteḥ s'abdāntarācca*

If it be said, 'not so, on account of the designation of the effect as non-existent, (*i.e. Asat*)', we reply, not so; on account of such designation being due to another attribute, as appears from the supplementary passage, from reasoning and from another verbal testimony.

The effect has been designated as a non-existent being at that time, in the scriptural text, 'In the beginning, truly, there

व्यपदेशात् कारणे कार्यमसदिति चेत्; न। स्थूलत्वविरोधिसूक्ष्मत्वरूप-धर्मान्तरयोगादसत्त्वव्यपदेशः[1]। कुतः? "तदसदेव सन्मनोऽकुरुत, स्याम्" इति वाक्यशेषादवगम्यते। मनस्कारो हि विद्यमानस्यैव। युक्तिश्चासद्व्य-पदेशो धर्मान्तरयोगनिमित्त इति गमयति। पिण्डत्वघटत्वकपालत्वादि-परस्परविरोधिभिर्भावरूपैर्धर्मैः 'घटः प्राङ् नासीत्, इदानीमस्ति, भविष्यति च' इति सदा विद्यमानस्यैव मृद्द्रव्यस्य [2]ह्यसदादिव्यपदेशः। तथा शब्दान्तरं च—"तद्धेदं तर्ह्यव्याकृतमासीत्" इत्यादि ॥

was not anything whatever' (*Taiṭ. Br.* II-2-8). Therefore the effect does not exist in the cause. If such an objection arises, we say—It is not so. The designation as a non-existent being is due to the fact that the thing was with different attribute, *namely*, 'with a subtle state which is opposed to a gross state.' Why? It is so apprehended from the supplementary text, 'That Non-existent one formed the resolve, 'may I be' (*Taiṭ. Br.* II-28). Indeed the resolve can be made by that, which is extant. The reasoning also proves that the designation as non-existent is due to the association with a different attribute'. Indeed the substance, *namely*, 'The clod of clay', that is known to have an existence always, is designated a non-existent being etc. The illustrative example is this—The pot undergoes the changes and assumes the positive states, such as a clod of clay, the pot and the pieces of pot, that are mutually opposed to each other. By this reason it is generally said that 'This pot was in existence in a former time; it exists in the present time and it shall exist in a future time'. Other scriptural texts in support of this view are, 'Verily this was then undifferentiated' (*Bṛh.* I-4-7) etc.

[1] असद्व्यपदेशः A 1. [2] हि omitted M 2.

पटवच्च ॥ १९ ॥

तन्तव एव संयोगविशेषभाजः पट इति नामान्तरादिकं भजन्ते । तद्वत् ब्रह्मापि ॥

यथा च प्राणादिः ॥ २० ॥

यथा च वायुरेक एव वृत्तिविशेषैः प्राणापानादिनामानि भजते, तथा ब्रह्मापीति तदनन्यत्वं जगतः ॥

इतरव्यपदेशाधिकरणम् ७

इतरव्यपदेशाद्धिताकरणादिदोषप्रसक्तिः ॥ २१ ॥

19. *Paṭavacca*

And like a piece of cloth.

The very same threads by a particular form of conjunction among themselves, assume the different names cloth etc. The same is the case with the *Brahman* also.

20. *Yatha ca prāṇādiḥ*

And like the vital wind, etc.

The one wind, due to the modifications with different functions in the body, acquires the names such as *Prāna* and *Apāna.*[1] In the same way the *Brahman* also assumes the different names and forms. Therefore, the world is not different from the *Brahman.*

ITARAVYAPADES'ĀDHIKARANA 7

21. *Itaravyapades'āddhitākaraṇādidoṣaprasaktiḥ*

From the designation of the Brahman as the other (*i.e.* individual soul), there result in the *Brahman* the

[1] The vital winds are five in number. They are Prāṇa, Apāna, Vyāna, Udāna and Samāna. Prāṇa has its seat in the lungs. The Apāna is that which goes downwards and out of the anus. Vyāna is diffused through the whole body. Udāna rises up the throat and enters into the head. Samāna has the seat in the cavity of the naval and is essential for the digestion of food.

"तत्त्वमसि" "अयमात्मा ब्रह्म" इति कार्यभूतस्य जीवस्य ब्रह्मभावव्यपदेशात्तदनन्यत्वमुक्तम् । एवं तर्हि सर्वज्ञस्य सत्यसंकल्पस्य ब्रह्मण आत्मनो हितरूपकार्यजगदकरणम्, [1]अहितरूपकार्यकरणं चेत्यादिदोषप्रसक्तिः ॥

नैतत्;

अधिकं तु भेदनिर्देशात् ॥ २२ ॥

कार्यकारणयोरनन्यत्वेऽपि जीवस्वरूपात् ब्रह्मस्वरूपमर्थान्तरम् ।

non-creation of what is beneficial and also other imperfections.

It is said in the scriptural text 'That thou art' (*Chānd.* VI-8-7). 'This self is *Brahman*' (*Bṛh.* VI-4-5) that the individual self, who is an effect, is not different from the *Brahman*. According to this truth, there arise in Him, the faults such as 'The *Brahman*, who is all-knowing and who possesses the true will, does not create the world, that is beneficial to Himself and He creates those things, which are not beneficial.'

This objection is not correct—

22. *Adhikaṁ tu bhedanirdeśāt*

But the Brahman is higher, on account of the declaration of difference.

We admit that the cause is not different from the effect; yet the nature of the *Brahman* is different from that of the individual selves. This is proved by the scriptural texts,

[1] अहितकार्यं M 2, 3.

"करणाधिपाधिपः" "विद्याविद्ये ईशते यस्तु सोऽन्यः" इत्यादिभेदनिर्देशात्। चिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरं ब्रह्मैव कारणावस्थं कार्यावस्थं चेति गुणदोषव्यवस्थितिरिति "न तु दृष्टान्तभावात्" इत्युक्तम्। "यस्य पृथिवी शरीरम्" "यस्यात्मा शरीरम्" इत्यादिश्रुतिशतसमधिगतं चिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकत्वम्॥

अश्मादिवच्च तदनुपपत्तिः॥ २३॥

अश्मकाष्ठलोष्टतृणादेरचेतनस्येव जीवस्य "अनीशया शोचति

'He is the Lord of what is the lord of the senses (*i.e.* the individual self)' (*S'vet.* VI-9). 'He who commands the *Vidyā* (the knowledge) and *Avidyā* (the other than the knowledge *i.e.* action); is different'. (*S'vet.* V-1). The *Brahman*, who has all the sentient and non-sentient beings as His body, has assumed the states of cause and effect. Thus the merits and the faults have been restricted. This has been stated in *Brahma-Sūtra* II-1-9. That He has all the sentient and non-sentient beings as body is proved in the scriptural text, 'To whom the earth is the body' (*Sub.* VII). 'To whom the self is the body' (*Bṛh. Mādhya.* V-7-22.)

23. *As'mādivacca tadanupapattiḥ*

And as in the analogous cases of the stones and the like, it is not possible for the self to be identical with the *Brahman*.

The non-sentient beings, such as stones, wood, the lump of clay and the grass, etc. cannot be the same as the *Brahman*. So also it has been established that the individual selves that

मुह्यमानः" इत्यादिनात्यन्तविसजातीयतयावगतस्य[1] सर्वज्ञसत्यसंकल्पब्रह्म-स्वरूपतानुपपत्तिः सिद्धैवेत्यर्थः[2] ॥

उपसंहारदर्शनाधिकरणम् ८

उपसंहारदर्शनान्नेति चेन्न, क्षीरवद्धि ॥ २४ ॥

कार्यनिर्वृत्तावनेककारकोपसंहारदर्शनात् ब्रह्मैकमेव [3]जगत्कारणं न भवेदिति चेन्न, क्षीरस्यैकस्यैव दधिभावावत् ब्रह्मणोऽपि तत् संभवति ॥

देवादिवदपि लोके ॥ २५ ॥

are known to be distinct from the *Brahman* as per the scriptural text 'He grieves deluded by the subordinate one *i.e. Prakṛti*' cannot be the same as the *Brahman* who is all-knowing and true in His will.

UPASAMHĀRADARS'ANĀDHIKARANA 8

24. *Upasamhāradars'anānneti cenna, kṣīravaddhi*

Should it be said that it is not so, because it is seen that various instruments have been employed; we say, not so; because it is similar to the case of milk.

It is seen that a number of instruments are employed in producing the effect. Hence the *Brahman* cannot be the single cause of the world. It is not so. The *Brahman* becomes the single cause of the creation, etc., of the world, in the same way as the milk transforming itself into the form of the curd.

25. *Devādivadapi loke*

And as in the case of the divinities etc. in their worlds.

[1] अभिहितस्य M 2. [2] सिध्यत्येवेत्यर्थः M 2. [3] जगदाकारकार्यं M 2.



यथा देवादेः शास्त्रावगतशक्तेः स्वसंकल्पादेव स्वे स्वे लोके स्वापेक्षितनानारूपभावः, एवं ब्रह्मणोऽपि शास्त्रावगतशक्तेः सर्वमुपपन्नम् ॥

कृत्स्नप्रसक्त्यधिकरणम् ९

कृत्स्नप्रसक्तिर्निरवयवत्वशब्दकोपो वा ॥ २६ ॥

चिदचिद्वस्तुशरीरकं ब्रह्मैव कार्यकारणावस्थमिति ह्युक्तम् । तत्र ब्रह्मणः शरीरिणो निरवयवत्वेन कृत्स्नस्य ब्रह्मणः कार्यत्वेनोपयोगप्रसक्तिः । कार्यावस्थायामप्यंशान्तरेणावस्थितमिति[1] च पक्षे निरवयवत्वशब्दकोपः स्यात् । अतो ब्रह्म न कारणम् ॥

The divine beings, whose powers we know from the scriptures, assume many forms in their worlds by mere volition. In the same way all these are possible in the case of the *Brahman* also, whose powers we know only from the scriptures.

KṚTSNAPRASAKTYADHIKARAṆA 9

26. *Kṛtsnaprasaktirniravayavatvaśabdakopo vā*

It follows as a logical sequel that the entire Brahman enters into the effect or the text teaching about His being devoid of parts wiil be contradicted.

It is stated that the *Brahman*, who has all the sentient and non-sentient beings as His body, assumes the states of the cause and the effect. Here the *Brahman*, who is thus embodied has been held as 'not having any parts'. Here it happens that the *Brahman*, taken as a whole, is transformed into the effect. In the school that accepts that a portion of the

[1] अंशान्तरेणैवावस्थितमिति A 1; अंशान्तरेणावस्थितिरिति M 1, 2.

परिहरति—

श्रुतेस्तु शब्दमूलत्वात् ॥ २७ ॥

श्रुतिप्रामाण्यान्नैवं प्रसज्यते । शब्दैकप्रमाणकत्वाद्ब्रह्मस्वरूपस्य सकलेतरप्रमाणावगतवस्तुविसजातीयत्वेन तत्रादृष्टशक्तियोगो ब्रह्मणो न विरुद्धः । अतः कार्यत्वेन कारणत्वेन च परिपूर्णस्यैवावस्थानं संभवति, यथा जातिवादिनां जातेः खण्डमुण्डादिषु ॥

•

Brahman assumes the state of effect, the scriptural statement, *namely* 'The *Brahman* has no parts' becomes furious *i.e.* contradicted. Therefore the *Brahman* is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

This view has been refuted thus—

27. S'rutestu S'abdamūlatvāt

But on account of the scriptureal authority it is not so; because the *Brahman's* nature could be apprehended only by the verbal testimony.

This objection does not happen as scriptures have been accepted to be the proofs. The nature of the *Brahman* can be proved only by the means of scriptures. The *Brahman* is distinct from other objects that could be established by other proofs. Therefore no contradiction arises, if the *Brahman* is possessed with powers unseen in other objects. Therefore the result is this :—'The *Brahman* is full in every way of all qualities both in the causal state and in the state of effect.' This is just as the Jāti (class) of those who accept it as a separate category, is full in each of the cows with broken horn or hornless.

आत्मनि चैवम्; विचित्राश्च हि ॥ २८ ॥

जीवात्मनि चाचिद्धर्मविरोधिधर्मयोगो विसजातीयशक्तित्वादेव । अग्निजलादयोऽप्यचिद्विशेषा अन्योन्यविलक्षणा नियतशक्तयो विचित्रा दृश्यन्ते ॥

स्वपक्षदोषाच्च ॥ २९ ॥

कृत्स्नप्रसक्त्यादिदोषो निरवयवेऽचित्सजातीये प्रधान एवेति ब्रह्मैव कारणम् ॥

28. *Ātmani caivam*; *vicitrāśca hi*

And thus (also) in the Self; for there are diversified powers.

The individual self possesses attributes, that are opposed to those subsisting in the non-sentient beings. This is due to the special powers found in him. The non-sentient beings, such as fire and water, etc. possess the mutually opposing attributes, have the powers specially attached to them and are seen distinct from each other.

29. *Svapakṣadoṣācca*

And on account of the defects of his own views also.

The defects, such as the whole should transform itself into the effect, do exist only in the case of the *Pradhāna*, that is without parts and is of the same class as non-sentient beings. Hence the *Brahman* is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

सर्वोपेता च तद्दर्शनात् ॥ ३० ॥

"परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते" इति श्रुतेः सर्वशक्तियोगश्च देवताया अवगम्यते ॥

विकरणत्वान्नेति चेत्, तदुक्तम् ॥ ३१ ॥

"न तस्य कार्यं करणं च विद्यते" इति ब्रह्मणो विकरणत्वात् कारणत्वं नेति चेत्, तस्योत्तरं शब्दैकमूलत्वेन विसजातीयत्वादिति पूर्वसूत्रोक्तमेव ॥

30. *Sarvopetā ca taddrśanāt*

And the divinity is endowed with all powers; because it is so seen in the scriptures.

The divinity is apprehended as being endowed with all powers in the scriptural text, 'His high power is revealed as manifold, etc.' (*S'vet.* VI-8).

31. *Vikaraṇatvānneti cet, taduktam*

It is not so on account of His being devoid of organs. This question has been answered before.

Brahman is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world, as He does not possess organs. This is stated in the scriptural text, 'No body or organ of His is found to exist' (*S'vet.* VI-8). Here the reply is this—In a former Sūtra II-1-27, it has been stated that the nature of the *Brahman* can be proved only by the means of scriptures and He is distinct from all other objects.

प्रयोजनवत्त्वाधिकरणम् १०

न प्रयोजनवत्त्वात् ॥ ३२ ॥

ब्रह्मणोऽवाप्तसमस्तकामत्वेन [1]सृष्टौ प्रयोजनाभावात् ब्रह्म न कारणम् ॥

लोकवत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम् ॥ ३३ ॥

[2]अवाप्तसमस्तकामस्यापि [3]लीलाप्रयोजनत्वे नैरपेक्ष्यं संभवति, लोके केवललीलायै कन्तुकाद्यारम्भदर्शनात् । अस्यात्मतृप्तस्यावाप्तसमस्तकामत्वं[4]

PRAYOJANAVATTVĀDHIKARANA 10

32. *Na prayojanavattvāt*

The Brahman is not the cause on account of the world having the nature of what depends on a motive.

The *Brahman* has all His wishes fulfilled. Therefore there is no use in creating the world. Hence the *Brahman* is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

33. *Lokavattu līlākaivalyam*

But it is mere sport, as in ordinary worldly life.

As regards the creation of the world, sport can be the motive, though He has all wishes fulfilled. Hence, it is appropriate to say that He does not expect any thing to gain by the creation etc. of the world. In ordinary life balls etc. are used in games for mere sport. In the case of Him, who is self-satisfied, 'fulfilment of all wishes' means 'the

[1] सृष्टिप्रयोजनाभावात् A 1, M 2.

[2] आप्त M 3.

[3] लीलायाः सृष्टिप्रयोजनत्वे A 1.

[4] अवाप्तकामत्वं M 2.

हि सदाभिमतसकलभोगोपकरणसद्भाव॰ । आत्मतृप्तेर्भोगतृप्तिर्विसजातीया । लीलारसस्यापि तद्विलक्षणस्य त्रिगुणपुरुषाद्युपकरणत्वमेव[1] ॥

वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये न, सापेक्षत्वात्; तथाहि दर्शयति ॥ ३४ ॥

देवादिविषमसृष्ट्या पक्षपातो नैर्घृण्यं च न संभवति परस्य, [2]क्षेत्रज्ञकर्मापेक्षत्वाद्विषमसृष्टेः । तथा "साधुकारी साधुर्भवति । पापकारी पापो भवति" इति श्रुतिरेव दर्शयति ॥

readiness of all necessaries that are essential for the enjoyment of all pleasures at all times'. The satisfaction arrived from the enjoyment of pleasures, is distinct from the self-satisfaction. The taste in sport is distinct from the twofold satisfaction mentioned above. The *Pradhāna* and the individual self are necessaries essential for His sport.

34. *Vaiṣamyanairghṛṇye na, sāpekṣatvāt; tathā hi darśayati*

In the part of the Brahman there is neither the inequality nor the cruelty; on account of the consideration of something; for so the scriptures declare.

While creating the gods and others of different status in life, He is neither partial nor cruel by temperament. The inequality in creation by the Highest Self is due to the *Karmans* or deeds of the individual selves. This is seen in the scriptural text thus—'He, who does good work, becomes good; he, who does evil work, becomes evil' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-5).

[1] उपकरणं नित्यमेव A 1, M 1.	[2] क्षेत्रज्ञकर्मसापेक्षत्वात् M 3.

न कर्माविभागादिति चेन्न, अनादित्वादुपपद्यते चाप्युपलभ्यते च ॥ ३५ ॥

"सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेव" इत्येकत्वावधारणात्तदानीं क्षेत्रज्ञाभावात् कर्म न संभवतीति चेत्; न। अनादित्वात् क्षेत्रज्ञानां तत्तत्कर्मप्रवाहश्चास्त्येव। उपपद्यते च तदनादित्वेऽप्यविभागश्रुतिः, नामरूपविभागाभावात्; "तद्धेदं तर्ह्यव्याकृतमासीत्तन्नामरूपाभ्यां व्याक्रियत" इत्यनयैकार्थ्यात्। उपलभ्यते च श्रुतिषु क्षेत्रज्ञानादित्वम्, "ज्ञाज्ञौ द्वावजावीशनीशौ" "नित्यो नित्यानाम्" इति ॥

35. *Na karmāvibhāgāditi cenna, anāditvādupapadyate cāpyupalabhyate ca*

If it be said, there are no deeds, because of the non-difference; we say 'not so, on account of beginninglessness'; this is reasonable and it is also so observed.

One-ness is apprehended in the scriptural text, 'Existence alone, my dear, was in the beginning; One only' (*Chānd.* VI-2-1). At that time, the individual selves were not extant. Hence the *Karmans* or deeds do not attach themselves to the individual selves. It is not so; as the individual selves have not a beginning, the stream of their deeds also have not a beginning. This is reasonable. The individual selves have not a beginning; yet the scriptural text that states the non-difference, only establishes the non-distinction due to the absence of the name and form. The text is this 'Verily at that time this world was undifferentiated. It became differentiated just by name and form' (*Bṛh.* I-4-7). The view said above is in harmony with this text. The scriptural texts, that establish the beginningless nature of the

सर्वधर्मोपपत्तेश्च ॥ ३६ ॥

प्रधानपरमाण्वादिष्वनुपपन्नानां सर्वधर्माणां ब्रह्मणि सकलेतरविलक्षणत्वेन सर्वशक्तिश्रुत्या चोपपत्तेर्ब्रह्मैव कारणमिति सिद्धम् ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे द्वितीयस्याध्यायस्य प्रथमः पादः ॥

---

individual selves are this—'The two unborn, the intelligent and the non-intelligent are the Lord and the non-lord' (*S'vet.* I-9). 'He is eternal among eternals'. (*S'vet.* VI-13).

36. *Sarvadharmopapattes'ca*

And because all the attributes are proved to be present in the *Brahman*.

All those attributes, that are impossible in the *Pradhāna* and the atoms, are found in the *Brahman*; because He is apprehended as being distinct from all other objects. All His powers are proved in the scriptures. Hence, it is established that the *Brahman* only is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

THUS ENDS THE 1ST PĀDA OF THE 2ND ADHYĀYA.

द्वितीयाध्याये द्वितीयः पादः

रचनानुपपत्त्यधिकरणम् १

रचनानुपपत्तेश्च नानुमानं प्रवृत्तेश्च ॥ १ ॥

दार्वादेरचेतनस्य रथप्रासादादिनिर्माणे [1]तज्ज्ञानधिष्ठितस्य रचनानुपपत्तेश्च तज्ज्ञाधिष्ठितस्य रचनाप्रवृत्तेश्चानुमानगम्यं प्रधानमचेतनं प्राज्ञानधिष्ठितं न जगत्कारणम् ॥

ADHYĀYA II, PĀDA II

RACANĀNUPAPATTYADHIKARANA 1

1. *Racanānupapattiś ca nānumānaṁ pravṛttiś ca*

The *Ānumāna* (*Pradhāna*) is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world, on account of the impossibility of construction and on account of activity.

The construction of chariots, mansions, etc. cannot be accomplished by the non-sentient beings, such as wood etc. without being employed by a person, who knows how to do them. And they could be made when they are employed by the person, who knows how to do them. Hence the ***Pradhāna***, that is non-sentient being, that could be proved by the inference only and that is not guided by an intelligent person cannot be the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

[1] तदभिज्ञानधि M 3, Pr.

पयोऽम्बुवच्चेत्, तत्रापि ॥ २ ॥

यथा पयोऽम्बु च दध्यादिभावेऽनपेक्षं तद्वत्प्रधानमिति[1] चेत्, तत्राप्युक्त एव हेतुः; तस्यापि पक्षीकृतत्वात् ॥

व्यतिरेकानवस्थितेश्चानपेक्षत्वात् ॥ ३ ॥

प्राज्ञाधिष्ठितत्वानपेक्षत्वे[2] सर्वदा सृष्टिप्रसङ्गाच्च न प्रधानं कारणम्[3] ॥

2. *Payombuvaccet, tatrāpi*

If it be said like milk or water; there also the intelligent guides.

The milk and the water are not guided by an intelligent person, when they undergo the changes of curds etc. Same is the case with the *Pradhāna* also. The answer is thus—Even in this case the reason of refutation is the same as stated already; because these milk and water also are included in the minor term.

3. *Vyatirekānavasthiteścānapekṣatvāt*

And because from the independence of the *Pradhāna*, there would be never the reverse of the creation of the world.

The *Pradhāna* is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world; otherwise the creation would take place always, as the guidance of the intellegent is not at all required.

[1] प्रधानमपीति A 1, Pr. [2] नपेक्षत्वेन M 1, Pr.
[3] कारणम् omitted M 1, 2.

अन्यत्राभावाच्च न तृणादिवत् ॥ ४ ॥

[1]क्षीरभावे धेनूपभुक्ततृणादिवत् प्रधानमपीति न युक्तं वक्तुम्; तद्धि प्राज्ञाधिष्ठितम् ॥

पुरुषाश्मवदिति चेत्, तथापि ॥ ५ ॥

पुरुषः स्वसंनिधानात्प्रधानं प्रवर्तयति; अन्धपङ्गुपुरुषवत्, अयश्चायस्कान्ताश्मवदिति न प्राज्ञापेक्षेति चेत्—न[3]; तथापि न प्रधान-

4. *Anyatrābhāvācca na tṛṇādivat*

Not like grass, etc.; because it does not happen in cases.

It is not right to say that the *Pradhāna* is the cause of the etc. of the world in the same way as grass, etc. are capable of being modified as the milk when they are eaten by he cows; because in the case of bulls, etc., such a transformation is not seen. Therefore the modification of the grass etc. nto the milk etc. also is guided by an intelligent agent.

5. *Puruṣāśmavaditi cet tathāpi*

And if it is said as in the case of the person and the thus also the *Pradhāna* cannot be the cause of creation, etc. of the world.

The self, by his presence, directs the *Pradhāna* to the world. This is similar to the case of a blind man by a lame one. Another instance is the case of a stone towards which the iron moves. Therefore the

[1] क्षीरीभवद्धेनू A 1, Pr. क्षीरभावेधेनू M 2.

[2] अन्धवत् added before. A 1, Pr. अयश्च omitted M 2.

[3] न omitted A 1.

प्रवृत्तिसंभवः, अविकृतत्वात्पुरुषस्य। [1]पङ्ग्वश्मादेर्मार्गोपदेशदेशान्तरगमनादिः कादाचित्को विकारो ह्यस्ति ॥

अङ्गित्वानुपपत्तेश्च ॥ ६ ॥

गुणानामुत्कर्षापकर्षरूपाङ्गाङ्गिभावाद्धि जगत्प्रवृत्तिः। प्रतिसर्गावस्थायां साम्यावस्थानां तेषां वैषम्यकृताङ्गाङ्गिभावानुपपत्तेश्च न जगदारम्भः ॥

Pradhāna need not be guided by an intelligent self. It is not so. Even then the *Pradhāna* cannot be the cause of the creation, etc. of the world; because the intelligent person does not undergo any change. The lame man and the magnetic stone undergo the occasional changes by advising the path and moving from one place to another.

6. *Aṅgitvānupapatteśca*

And on account of the impossibility of the prominence with relationship as prominent and subordinate.

The origination of the world results from a certain relation between the three *Gunas* as principal and subordinate which depends upon the relative inferiority and superiority. But, as in the *Pralaya* state, the three *Gunas* are in a state of equipoise, none of them is superior or inferior to the others. Hence, the creation, of the world would not take place.

[1] पङ्ग्वश्मादेः M 1, 3, Pr.

अन्यथानुमितौ च ज्ञशक्तिवियोगात् ॥ ७ ॥

ज्ञस्य या शक्तिः, तद्वियोगात् । ज्ञातृत्वशक्तिवियोगादित्यर्थः । उक्तप्रकारव्यतिरिक्तप्रकारेण प्रधानानुमितौ च प्रधानस्य ज्ञातृत्वशक्तिवियोगात् रचनानुपपत्त्यादयो दोषास्तदवस्थाः ॥

अभ्युपगमेऽप्यर्थाभावात् ॥ ८ ॥

प्रधानाभ्युपगमेऽपि प्रयोजनाभावान्न तदनुमेयम् । पुरुषस्य निर्विकारस्य

7. *Anyathānumitau ca jñaśaktiviyogāt*

And if the inference be made in a different way, the result remains unchanged, on account of the *Pradhāna* being destitute of the power of knowing.

The expression, 'Being destitute of the power of knowing' means, 'Being devoid of the power of an intelligent'. Suppose *Pradhāna* is inferred by some reasoning different from the one so far refuted by us, even then, as it is devoid of the power of knowing the difficulties such as the impossibility of construction, etc. mentioned in *Sūtra* II-2-1, do firmly stand.

8. *Abhyupagamepyarthābhāvāt*

On account of the absence of a purpose, even if it be admitted, it should not be inferred.

This is not to be inferred; because no purpose will be served by considering *Pradhāna* to be the cause of the creation, etc. of the world. The intelligent person, who does

प्रधानदर्शनरूपविकारासंभवात् [1]प्रकृतिधर्माध्यासनिमित्तभोगस्तद्विवेकानुसंधानकृतकैवल्यं च न संभवति ॥

विप्रतिषेधाच्चासमञ्जसम् ॥ ९ ॥

पुरुषस्य द्रष्टृत्वभोक्तृत्वनिर्विकारत्वादिविरुद्धसहस्राभ्युपगमाच्चासमञ्जसं कापिलमतम् ॥

महद्दीर्घाधिकरणम् २

[2]**महद्दीर्घवद्वा ह्रस्वपरिमण्डलाभ्याम् ॥ १० ॥**

not undergo any change, does not transform himself into the forms that the *Pradhāna* is capable of assuming. Hence, the two things that do not happen are these—(1) the enjoyment of pleasures etc., that is caused by the superimposition of the attributes of the *Prakṛti* on the intelligent person and (2) the release that could be had by distinguishing himself from the *Pradhāna*.

9. *Vipratiṣedhāccāsamañjasam*

And the whole thing accepted in regard to the Self, is not intelligible on account of the contradiction.

The doctrine of the *Kāpilas* is not intelligible ; because of the acceptance of many contradictory terms in the intelligent person, such as the powers of sight, enjoyment, and non-modification, etc.

MAHADDĪRGHĀDHIKARAṆA 2

10. *Mahaddhīrghavad vā hrasvaparimaṇḍalābhyām*

And the views of others like the one that accepts

[1] प्रकृतिधर्माध्यासस्तन्निमित्तभोगः M 1, 2.

[2] महद्दीर्घशब्दाभ्यां त्र्यणुकस्य, ह्रस्वशब्देन द्व्यणुकस्य, परिमण्डलशब्देन परमाणोश्च निर्देशः

असमञ्जसमिति वर्तते[1]। वाशब्दश्चार्थे। ह्रस्वपरिमण्डलाभ्यां महद्दीर्घवत्; द्व्यणुकपरमाणुभ्यां [2]त्र्यणुकोत्पत्तिवदन्यच्च तन्मतं सर्वमसमञ्जसम्। अवयवाः स्वकीयैः षड्भिः पार्श्वैः संयुज्यमाना हि पृथुतरमवयविनमारभन्ते। परमाणूनां निरवयवत्वेन पार्श्वानभ्युपगमात् पार्श्वाननपेक्ष्य संयुज्यमानानां न [3]पृथु नेषां द्रव्यारम्भकत्वसंभवः[4]॥

उभयथापि न कर्मातस्तदभावः॥ ११॥

the production of big and long from the short and the atom, are untenable.

The word Asamañjasa (untenable) is brought here from the previous *Sūtra*. The word, Vā (*i.e.* or) is used in the sense of Ca (*i.e.* and). Completely unintelligible are the views of that school, which hold the doctrine that the *Tryaṇuka* which is big and long is formed from the *Dvyaṇukas* (shorts) and *Paramāṇus* (atoms).[5] As a rule the parts, that possess six sides, begin the formation of a bigger object in combination. The atoms have no parts. Hence, they cannot have sides. Things such as atoms, that are brought together without any regard to their sides cannot produce a big object.

11. *Ubhayathāpi na karmātastadabhāvaḥ*

On both assumptions, motion does not originate in the atoms and thence there is no origination of the world.

[1] अनुवर्तते M 1, 2.

[2] द्व्यणुकत्र्यणुकोत्पत्तिवत् A 1, Pr. त्र्यणुकद्व्यणुकोत्पत्तिवत् M 3.

[3] पृथुतर M 2, Pr.

[4] द्रव्यारम्भसंभवः M 3.

[5] According to the *Vaiśeṣika* system of the philosophy, two Paramāṇus (atoms *alias* Parimaṇḍalas) form a Dvyaṇuka (dyad) which is Hrasva or short in size Three Dvyaṇukas (dyads) form a Tryaṇuka (Ternary) which is Mahat (big) and Dīrgha (long).

अणुगताद्यकर्मासंभवात्तत्कृताणुसंयोगाभावः[1] । क्षेत्रज्ञादृष्टानां विपाकापेक्षत्वेऽपि न तत्कृतकादाचित्काणुगतकर्मसंभवः । अनपेक्षत्वे प्रागप्युत्पादकं स्यात् । [2]विपाको नाम कश्चिददृष्टगतो धर्मो न [3]जायते । कर्मविधिवेलायामेव कालविशेषनियतफलदायित्वं यस्य कर्मणश्चोदितं, तस्य [4]तत्कालागम एव विपाकः । अनियतकालविशेषाणां कर्मणां प्रबलकर्मान्तराप्रतिबन्ध एव विपाकः[5] । अदृष्टानि च तत्तत्कर्मानुगुणफलदानस्वभावानि । अतोऽनन्तैरात्मभिर्विविधकालफलदायित्वेनानुष्ठितानामेकदैकरूपविपाको न संभवति । अनुमेयेश्वरासिद्धेस्तदधिष्ठानाच्च न संभवति ॥

It is impossible to accept that first motion can originate in the atoms. Therefore the conjunction of two or more atoms is impossible to accept. Though there may be required the maturity of the *Adṛṣṭa* (*i.e.* the unseen principle) in the individual selves, even then, the occasional motion, that is caused by the *Adṛṣṭa*, cannot have its origin in the atoms. Suppose the maturity is not required, then the motion should have been produced in the atoms even before. In fact, maturity is not newly produced as a certain attribute in *Adṛṣṭa*. When regarded as commandments, particular actions yield particular results. Then at that particular time the individual selves attain that fruit. This is called as a maturation. When no particular time is fixed for such fruits, the maturation is the state of being not obstructed by more powerful deeds. *Adṛṣṭa* has the nature of granting the results, that are dependant upon the nature of the actions. Hence, maturity does not find a fixed place in all the individual selves at the same time; because the various actions grant various results at various times. The Lord can not be proved by the inference. Hence,

[1] संयोगाभावात् A 1. [2] अतः added before M 1. [3] ज्ञायते Pr.
[4] तत्तत्कालागमः M 3, Pr [5] कर्मान्तरप्रतिबन्ध एवाविपाकः M 1, 2, 3.

समवायाभ्युपगमाच्च साम्यादनवस्थितेः ॥ १२ ॥

समवायाभ्युपगमाच्चासमञ्जसम्, समवायस्यापि जातिगुणादेरिवापृथक्सिद्धिहेत्वपेक्षासाम्यादनवस्थितेः । समवायस्य तत्स्वभावकल्पनायां जात्यादेरेव तत्स्यात्त्वयम् ॥

नित्यमेव च भावात् ॥ १३ ॥

समवायस्य नित्यत्वाभ्युपगमे संबन्धिनित्यत्वमन्तरेण तदनुपपत्तेरवयवावयविनोरुभयोर्नित्यत्वप्रसङ्गादसदेवेदम् ॥

it is impossible to argue that the atoms can create the world under the direction of the Lord.

12. *Samavāyābhyupagamācca sāmyādanavasthiteḥ*

And because, owing to the acknowledgment of *Samavāya*, there results *regressus ad infinitum*, on account of equality.

The views of the *Vaiśeṣikas* are also untenable, on account of the acknowledgment of *Samavāya*; because *Samavāya* also like the Jāti (class) and Guṇa (qualities), requires something else, to prove the fact of its being inseparably connected. From this there arises the fallacy of *regressus in infinitum.* If it is argued that this nature of the *Samavāya* is such as being connected inseparably without requiring other means to prove it, let the same principle applied with the case of Jāti and Guṇa also.

13. *Nityameva ca bhāvāt*

And because the part and the whole, would thus be eternal on account of its eternity.

Samavāya is considered to be eternal. Such a consideration is not possible without that, to which the relation

रूपादिमत्त्वाच्च विपर्ययो दर्शनात्[1] ॥ १४ ॥

परमाणूनां रूपादिमत्त्वान्नित्यत्वादिविपर्ययश्च, घटादिषु तथा दर्शनात् ॥

उभयथा च दोषात् ॥ १५ ॥

अनित्यत्वादिभयात् [2]परमाणूनां रूपादिशून्यत्वे कार्यगुणस्य कारणगुणपूर्वकत्वासिद्धिः[3] । तद्भयाद्रूपादिमत्त्वे चानित्यत्वादीत्युभयथा च दोषादसमञ्जसमेव ॥

belongs, being accepted as eternal. Hence both the parts and the whole which is constituted of such parts, happen to be eternal. Hence this *Samavāya* does not exist at all.

14. *Rūpādimattvācca viparyayo darśanāt*

And on account of the atoms having colour, etc. the reverse (*i.e.* non-eternity of atoms) takes place; because it is so observed.

The atoms have colour etc. Hence its characteristics would be other than eternity, because such a principle is observed in regard to the pots, etc.

15. *Ubhayathā ca doṣāt*

And as there are defects in both the cases.

Suppose the atoms have no colour, because otherwise they become non-eternal, then the principle 'The properties of the effect are due to the properties of the cause' will have to be abandoned. If they have colour, they must be non-eternal. Therefore the whole argument is untenable; because faults do arise in both the cases.

[1] अर्थदर्शनात् A 1. [2] परमाणूनां omitted A 1, M 1, Pr.
[3] असिद्धेः M 1, 2.

अपरिग्रहाच्चात्यन्तमनपेक्षा ॥ १६ ॥

[1]काणादपक्षे कस्याप्यंशस्य वैदिकैरपरिग्रहादनुपपन्नत्वाच्चात्यन्तमनपेक्षा ॥

समुदायाधिकरणम् ३

समुदाय उभयहेतुकेऽपि तदप्राप्तिः ॥ १७ ॥

अणुहेतुके पृथिव्यादिसमुदाये पृथिव्यादिहेतुके शरीरेन्द्रियादिसमुदाये[2] च सुगताभ्युपगते तदभ्युपगमप्रकारेणैव समुदायासिद्धिः । क्षणिकत्वं

16. *Aparigrahāccātyantamanapekṣā*

And as it is not accepted, it is altogether disregarded.

Any portion of Kāṇādas' system has not been accepted by the followers of the *Vedic* doctrine. It is also in lack of proof. Therefore, it is altogether to be disregarded.

SAMUDĀYĀDHIKARAṆA 3

17. *Samudāya ubhayahetukepi tadaprāptiḥ*

Even as regards the aggregate effect by its two causes, there is non-establishment of the theory of aggregates.

The Buddhists have accepted thus—' The aggregates of earth, etc. are caused by atoms. The aggregates of body and sense-organs etc. are produced by earth, etc.' The theory of aggregate is not provable by following the same line of their argument. They have definitely accepted the momentariness

[1] कणाद M 1, 2. [2] आदि omitted Pr.

हि तैरभ्युपगम्यते । संहतौ व्याप्रियमाणाः परमाणवः पृथिव्यादयश्च तदानीमेव नष्टाश्चेत्, के समुदायरूपेण संहन्यन्ते ?

इतरेतरप्रत्ययत्वादुपपन्नमिति चेत्; न, संघातभावानिमित्तत्वात् ॥ १८ ॥

[1]अस्थिरे स्थिरत्वबुद्धिरूपाविद्याया[2] रागद्वेषादिपरंपरायामन्योन्यकारणत्वात्सर्वमुपपन्नमिति चेत्; न, अविद्यायाः संघातभावानिमित्तत्वात् । न हि शुक्तिकादिषु रजतादिबुद्धिरूपाविद्यया शुक्तिकादिर्वस्तुतो रजतादि-

of all things. Suppose the atoms and earth, etc., that function in the formation of an aggregate, are destroyed in the second moment of their existence, then, what are those things, that could be collected together in the form of aggregates ?

18. *Itaretarapratyayatvādupapannamiti cet*; ***na***, *saṁghātabhāvānimittatvāt*

And if it be said that this is to be maintained through successive causality; we say, 'no'; on account of their not being the causes of aggregation.

If it be said that through the successive causality of nescience, that produces the knowledge of steadiness in unsteady objects, the desire and the aversion etc. all these may be accounted for. It is not so. The nescience cannot be the cause in the formation of aggregates. As regards nescience, where the knowledge of silver is produced in nacre, etc. the nacre, etc. cannot produce the purpose served by the

[1] अस्थिरेषु M 3, Pr. [2] अविद्यारागद्वेषादि Pr.

कार्यं करोति। [1]अविदुषस्तदानीमेव नष्टत्वादविद्यानिमित्तरागादयोऽपि न संभवन्ति ॥

उत्तरोत्पादे च पूर्वनिरोधात् ॥ १९ ॥

उत्तरघटक्षणोत्पत्तौ पूर्वघटक्षणस्य[2] विनष्टत्वेनाभावस्यैवोत्पादकत्वाविशेषेण सर्वदोत्पत्तिश्च स्यात् ॥

असति प्रतिज्ञोपरोधो[3] यौगपद्यमन्यथा ॥ २० ॥

असत उत्पत्तावधिपतिसहकार्यादीनां ज्ञानहेतुत्वप्रतिज्ञाविरोधश्च।

silver. Here, as the person of *Avidyā* ceased to exist at that time, there cannot be in him the desire, etc. that are caused by nescience.

19. *Uttarotpāde ca pūrvanirodhāt*

And on account of the cessation of the preceding one, on the origination of the subsequent one.

When the pot of the subsequent moment is originated, the pot of the previous moment becomes destroyed. Hence as the negation alone has the character of the cause of origination, the origination can be had at all times.

20. *Asati pratijñoparodho yaugapadyamanyathā*

There not being a cause, there results the contradiction of the admitted principle; otherwise simultaneity will arise.

Suppose it is said that the effect may originate when a

[1] अत्र विदुषः M 3, Pr. [2] क्षणस्यापि Pr.
[3] प्रतिज्ञाविरोधः M 1, 2.

तस्यापि स्थित्यभ्युपगमे युगपत् घटद्वयोपलब्धिप्रसक्तिः । अस्थितौ च संप्रयोगज्ञानादेर्यौगपद्यम् ॥

[1]प्रतिसंख्याप्रतिसंख्यानिरोधाप्राप्तिरविच्छेदात् ॥ २१ ॥

निरोधो निरन्वयविनाशः । स स्थूलः सूक्ष्मश्च न संभवति ; कपाला-

cause does not exist; then there results the contradiction to the acknowledged principle, *namely* '*Adhipati* cause and *Sahakārin* cause etc. produce cognition'.[2] If the cause exists, then it happens that two pots are perceived at the same time. If the cause does not exist, it would follow that the contact of the sense-organs with the object and the cognition are simultaneous.

21. *Pratisaṁkhyāpratisaṁkhyānirodhā-prāptiravicchedāt*

There is no possibility of *Pratisaṁkhyā* (gross form) and *Apratisaṁkhyā*[3] (subtle form) of the complete destruction, on account of the non-interruption.

'Nirodha' means 'complete destruction'. This does not assume the state of gross or subtle form. Because what

[1] क्षणिकत्ववादिभिर्मुद्गराभिघाताद्यनन्तरभावितयोपलब्धियोग्यः सदृशसंतानावसान-लक्षणः स्थूलो विनाशः प्रतिसंख्यानिरोधः, सदृशसंताने प्रतिक्षणभावी चोपलब्ध्यनर्हः सूक्ष्मो विनाशोऽप्रतिसंख्यानिरोध इति व्यवह्रियते ।

[2] The opponents hold the principle that there are four kinds of causes bringing about the origination of a cognition They are the *Ādhipati* (Sense-organs) *Sahakārin* (Associate cause, like the light etc), *Ālambana* (the object) and *Samanantarapratyaya* (the immediately previous knowledge)

[3] Those who maintain the momentariness of all things accept the two kinds of destruction, one of a gross kind which consists in the termination of a series of similar momentary existences and is capable of being perceived as immediately resulting from egencies such as the blow of a hammer etc.; and the other of a subtle kind not capable of being perceived and taking place in a series of similar momentary existences at every moment The former is called *Pratisaṁkhyā-nirodha* and the latter *Apratisamkhyānirodha*.

दिभावरूपावस्थाप्राप्तेरेव विनाशशब्दाभिधेयत्वात्; सतो द्रव्यस्याविच्छेदात् ॥

उभयथा च दोषात् ॥ २२ ॥

[1]उत्पन्नस्य तुच्छतापत्तौ तुच्छादुत्पत्तौ [2]चाभावादुत्पत्त्यसंभवात् [3]अभावात्मककार्यापत्तिरूपदोषात्तुच्छत्वासिद्धिः ॥

आकाशे चाविशेषात् ॥ २३ ॥

is denoted by the words, 'destruction of the pot' is 'the assumption of the state of the broken pieces.' Because also the substance, that has an existence, cannot brook an interruption.

22. Ubhayathā ca doṣāt

And on account of the defects presenting themselves in either case.

In the doctrine which accepts that the thing originated is of the nature of nothingness and the thing is originated from that of the nature of nothingness, the following difficulty could not be got over, *namely*—A thing cannot be produced from the negation and the thing so produced will be of the nature of negation. Hence, nothingness as stated by others can not be established.

23. Ākāśe cāviśeṣāt

And in the case of spatial ether also, on account of their being no difference.

[1] सत: added before M 1.
[2] च भावादुत्पत्त्य M 1.
[3] भावात्मक A 1, M 1, 3.

आकाशे च न तुच्छत्वम्, अबाधितप्रतीत्यविशेषात्। प्रतीयते ह्याकाशः श्येनादिपतनदेशत्वेन ॥

अनुस्मृतेश्च ॥ २४ ॥

प्रत्यभिज्ञानाच्च न क्षणिकत्वसिद्धिः। 'तदेवेदम्' इति हि सामानाधिकरण्येनातीतवर्तमानकालविशिष्टं[1] वस्तु 'एकम्' इति प्रतीयते। अस्याश्च सामग्री पूर्वानुभवजनितसंस्कारवतः पुरुषस्येन्द्रियसंप्रयोगः[2] ॥

नासतोऽदृष्टत्वात् ॥ २५ ॥

And the spatial ether has not the character of nothingness; because there is an unopposed apprehension without any exception. Indeed the spatial ether is apprehended as the space, where the hawk etc. fly.

24. *Anusmṛtes'ca*

And on account of the recognition.

Moreover the momentariness is not proved, on account of the recognition. In the recognition 'This is just that' the object is apprehended as being only one; because what is apprehended in the past time is the same as that which is apprehended in the present time due to the expression used in certain grammatical equation. The recognition is due to the contact between the substances and sense-organs of men who had seen previously the substance and possessed the mental impression on it.

25. *Nāsatodṛṣṭatvāt*

The experience could not be of non-entity; because this is not so observed.

[1] देशकालविशिष्टं M 2, 3, Pr. [2] संयोगः M, 2.

ज्ञानाकारवैचित्र्येण ज्ञाने स्वाकारं समर्प्य [1]विनष्टमप्यर्थमनुमिनोतीति वादश्च न संभवति, असतो विनष्टस्य धर्मिणो धर्मसंक्रमणस्यादृष्टत्वात्[2] ।

उदासीनानामपि चैवं सिद्धिः ॥ २६ ॥

क्षणिकत्वाभ्युपगमेऽनुष्ठातुरन्यत्वात् [3]फलिनः, निष्प्रयत्नानामपि सर्वार्थसिद्धिः स्यात् ॥

The argument *viz* 'The object that has perished after imparting its own form to the cognition, is inferred through the reason of such imparted forms of the cognition.' This argument is not sound, because, it is not so observed. When a thing perished, and ceased to exist, its attributes are not seen to attach themselves to a different object.

26. *Udāsīnānāmapi caivaṁ siddhiḥ*

And thus there would be the accomplishment on the part of the non-active people also.

On the theory of universal mementariness, it would happen that one is performer of the action and another is enjoyer of its benefit. Therefore it would follow that persons without making any efforts, may accomplish all their ends.

[1] विनष्टमर्थम् A 1, M 2.

[2] एतदनन्तरम् 'ज्ञाने नीलाद्याकार उपलभ्यते। स विनष्टस्यासतोऽर्थस्याकारो भवितुं नार्हति। कुतः? अदृष्टत्वात्। न खलु धर्मिणि विनष्टे तद्धर्मस्यार्थान्तरे संक्रमणं दृष्टम्' इत्यधिकः पाठः। M 2, 3, Pr.

[3] फलिनां Pr.

उपलब्ध्यधिकरणम् ४

नाभावउपलब्धेः ॥ २७ ॥

[1]ज्ञानव्यतिरिक्तार्थाभाववादश्च न संभवति । 'घटमहं जानामि' इति कर्तुर्ज्ञानकर्मतयार्थस्योपलब्धेर्न तदभावः शक्यते वक्तुम् । पुरुषस्यार्थविशेषव्यवहारानुगुण्यापादकत्वमेव हि ज्ञानस्याकारः ॥

वैधर्म्याच्च न स्वप्नादिवत् ॥ २८ ॥

[2]करणदोषबाधकप्रत्ययराहित्यरूपवैधर्म्याच्च न स्वप्नादिवज्जागरितज्ञानस्य मिथ्यात्वम् ॥

UPALABDHYADHIKARANA 4

27. *Nābhāva upalabdheḥ*

Not non-existence; on account of cognition.

The views held by other school *i.e.*, of *Yogācāra*, which hold that there are no objects apart from the knowledge, are not correct. What is apprehended in the notion, 'I know the pot', is the thing (pot) that is an object of the knowledge held by the knower. Therefore it is not possible to say that there is no separate thing. The special charactaristic of the cognition is only the capacity of production of the idea in men with reference to particular objects.

28. *Vaidharmyācca na svapnādivat*

And on account of difference of nature, the waking state is not like dream.

The knowledge found in waking state is not of unreal nature like the dream; because there is difference in their

[1] ज्ञानाकार A 1. [2] कारण Pr.

न भावोऽनुपलब्धेः ॥ २९ ॥

अर्थशून्यस्य ज्ञानस्य सद्भावो न संभवति, अनुपलब्धेः । स्वाप्नज्ञानस्याप्यर्थवत्तोपपादयिष्यते ॥

सर्वथानुपपत्त्यधिकरणम् ५

सर्वथाऽनुपपत्तेश्च ॥ ३० ॥

सर्वशून्यवादश्च न संभवति । सदिति [1]प्रतिज्ञायामसदिति [2]प्रतिज्ञायां च तुच्छता न संभवति, अनुपपत्तेः; सदसद्बुद्धितच्छब्दादीनां[3] वस्तुगतान्योन्यविरुद्धभावरूपावस्थाविशेषविषयत्वात् ॥

respective natures. In the waking state there are no defects in the sense-organs and the knowledge is not sublated as false.

29. *Na bhāvonupalabdheḥ*

The existence of mere knowledge is not possible, on account of the absence of perception.

The existence of mere cognition, devoid of corresponding objects, is not possible; because such things are nowhere perceived. That even the dream-cognitions refer to the objects will be maintained later on.

SARVATHĀNUPAPATTYADHIKARANA 5

30. *Sarvathānupapatteśca*

And on account of its improbability in every way.

The view of universal voidness of *Mādhyamikas* is not correct. When the proposition to be proved is either on existence or non-existence, it cannot be nothingness; because it is not so proved. Because the cognitions of existence (*i.e.*

[1] याः अ M 1. [2] यांश्च M 1. [3] तुच्छत्वादीनां M 1.

एकस्मिन्नसंभवाधिकरणम् ६

नैकस्मिन्नसंभवात् ॥ ३१ ॥

अर्हतो[1] मतं न युक्तिमत्, एकस्मिन् वस्तुनि युगपत् सत्त्वासत्त्व-नित्यत्वानित्यत्वभेदाभेदानामसंभवात्। पर्यायरूपाश्च [2]द्रव्यस्यास्तित्वनास्तित्वादिशब्दबुद्धिविषया: परस्परविरुद्धपिण्डत्वघटत्वकपालत्वाद्यवस्था युगपन्न संभवन्ति। तथा घटत्वशरावत्वाद्यवस्थाश्च पृथिव्यादे: प्रदेशभेदेन। तथाच द्रव्यस्यानित्यत्वमुत्पत्तिविनाशयोगित्वं तद्विपरीतं नित्यत्वं च नैकस्मिन् समवैति ॥

Sat) and non-existence (*i.e. Asat*) relate to the positive states of mutually contradictory natures of the objects.

EKASMINNASAMBHAVĀDHIKARANA 6

31. *Naikasminnasaṁbhavāt*

Not so, on account of the impossibility in one.

The views of the *Arhat* or *Jina*, are not tenable, because it is not possible for an object to assume simultaneously the states of existence and non-existence, permanence and non-permanence, and separateness and non-separateness. It is also impossible to accept that a substance undergoes different states (*Paryāyas*) simultaneously, because the states such as lumpness, potness, and the state of broken pieces etc. which are said to be the objects of the cognition of existence and non-existence, are mutually contradictory. The earth, etc. undergo the states of pot, plate, etc. in different parts It is not possible to apprehend in the same substance, impermanence and its opposing nature *namely*, permanence, because

[1] अर्हतोऽपि A 1, M 1. [2] द्रव्यस्यास्तित्वादि M 3, Pr.

एवं चात्माकार्त्स्न्यम् ॥ ३२ ॥

आत्मनः शरीरपरिमाणत्वे बृहतः शरीरादल्पीयसि प्रविशतोऽकार्त्स्न्यं विकलत्वं प्रसज्येत ॥

न च पर्यायादप्यविरोधो विकारादिभ्यः ॥ ३३ ॥

[1]तथा संकोचविकासावस्थायोगादपि नाविरोधः, घटादिवद्विकारादियोगप्रसक्तेः ॥

the former is the object of production and destruction and the latter is on *reverse.* Therefore these two attributes cannot pertain to a single thing.

32. *Evaṁ cātmākārtsnyam*

And thus the non-entireness of the self.

Suppose, the self is of the size of the body. When he enters from a big body to the body of a small one, it happens that he does not enter it with his full size but only partly. Then it will happen that the soul is not complete in the small body.

33. *Na ca paryāyādapyavirodho vikārādibhyaḥ*

Nor also is there non-contradiction from *Paryāya*; on account of change, etc.

Nor it can be said that the contradiction does not arise, as the self assumes a different condition through contraction and dilatation , because this would imply that the soul is the subject to change, like the pot, etc.

[1] तथाविध A 1.

अन्त्यावस्थितेश्चोभयनित्यत्वादविशेषः ॥ ३४ ॥

अन्त्यस्य मोक्षावस्थापरिमाणस्यैकरूपावस्थितेः, तस्य स्वाभाविकत्वेनात्मतत्परिमाणयोरुभयोर्नित्यत्वेन [1]पूर्वत्राप्यविशेषात् विविधदेहपरिमाणत्वे वैकल्यं स्यादेव ॥

पशुपत्यधिकरणम् ७

पत्युरसामञ्जस्यात् ॥ ३५ ॥

नेति वर्तते । [2]पशुपतेर्मतमनादरणीयम्, वेदविरुद्धनिमित्तोपादानभेदतद्विरुद्धाचारपरत्वेनासामञ्जस्यात् ॥

34. *Antyāvasthites'cobhayanityatvādavis'eṣaḥ*

And on account of the stability of the final size, and the resulting permanency of both, there is no speciality.

'The final size' means 'the size that exists in the state of release'. The self then remains with the same size always which is his natural size. Therefore the self and his size must both be eternal and the soul must be of the same size even in his former stages. Hence it will happen that if the soul is of the size of the various bodies, then he must be imperfect in those bodies.

PAS'UPATYADHIKARAṆA 7

35. *Patyurasāmañjasyāt*

The system of the school of *Pas'upati* must be disregarded on account of its inappropriateness.

The word 'not' continues from the previous *Sūtra*. The view of the school of *Pas'upati* has to be discarded; because it is objectionable on account of there being

[1] पूर्वत्रापि न विशेषः M 2, Pr.   [2] पशुपतेर्मतं नादरणीयम् A 1, M 2.

अधिष्ठानानुपपत्तेश्च ॥ ३६ ॥

अनुमेयेश्वराभ्युपगमेन हि [1]केवलाधिष्ठातृत्वमुच्यते । [2]तच्च न संभवति, तथासत्यशरीरस्य प्रधानाधिष्ठानानुपपत्तेः, सशरीरत्वे तु[3] [4]तच्छरीरोत्पत्त्यनिरूपणात्; सावयवस्य तस्य नित्यत्वे [5]महीमहीधरादीनामपि नित्यत्वाविरोधाच्च ॥

करणवच्चेन्न, भोगादिभ्यः ॥ ३७ ॥

deviations from the principles accepted in the *Vedic* doctrinel It accepts that the Lord *Pas'upati* is only the instrumenta. cause of the world and not the material cause also. This view is opposed to the principles of the *Vedic* doctrine. There are also rules of conduct, that are opposed to what are stated in the *Vedic* texts.

36. *Adhiṣṭhānānupapattes'ca*

And on account of the impossibility of agency.

Indeed, in the school that proves the existence of the Lord by inference, it is stated that the Lord is only the agent. This statement is not acceptable. If it were so, it happens that a bodiless Lord cannot be the agent of the *Pradhāna*. But suppose the Lord has a body; it is nowhere indicated, that His body is generated. Suppose He has limbs, and yet is eternal, then no contradiction arises in accepting the earth, and the mountain etc. as eternal.

37. *Karaṇavaccenna bhogādibhyaḥ*

[1] केवलाधिष्ठानत्वम् M 2
[2] तच्च न संभवति omitted Pr.
[3] तु omitted M 1
[4] शरीरोत्प M 2, Pr.
[5] महीमहार्णवादेरपि M 1.

करणकलेवराद्यधिष्ठानवदशरीरस्यैवाधिष्ठानमिति चेन्न, पुण्यपापनिमित्तत्वात्तस्य तत्फलभोगादिप्रसक्तेः ॥

अन्तवत्त्वमसर्वज्ञता वा ॥ ३८ ॥

तथा सति क्षेत्रज्ञवदन्तवत्त्वमसर्वज्ञता च ॥

[1]उत्पत्त्यसंभवाधिकरणम् ८

उत्पत्त्यसंभवात् ॥ ३९ ॥

If it is said that He is the agent as in the case of the organs; we deny this, because it would end in His enjoyment, etc.

The bodiless Lord is the agent of the *Pradhāna* as in the case of the individual self that rules the sense-organs and the body. It is not so. The activity of the individual selves with the rulership over the organs and body is due to the effect of their past good and bad deeds and is for the sake of enjoyment of pleasure and pain. The samething will happen in the Lord's case also.

38. *Antavattvamasarvajñatā vā*

Finiteness and absence of omniscience.

If the Lord is of the type stated above, He becomes finite and other than omniscient.

UTPATTYASAṀBHAVĀDHIKARAṆA 8

39. *Utpattyasaṁbhavāt*

(The views of the *pāñcarātra* system are untenable) on account of the impossibility of origination.

[1] This is also called the Pāñcarātrādhikaraṇa.

सांख्यादिवत्पाञ्चरात्रमपि जीवोत्पत्त्यभिधानात् श्रुतिविरुद्धत्वेन तदसंभवादप्रमाणम् ॥

न च कर्तुः करणम् ॥ ४० ॥

कर्तुर्जीवात् करणं मनश्च श्रुतावुत्पद्यत इति नोच्यते, "एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च" इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥

विज्ञानादिभावे वा तदप्रतिषेधः ॥ ४१ ॥

Like the system of the *Sāṁkhyas* the *Pāñcarātra* system also is not authoritative, because in that system it is stated that the individual selves are created. This is opposed to what is stated in the scriptures and hence this is also not possible.

40. *Na ca kartuḥ karaṇam*

And there is not the origination of the instrument from the agent.

The agent is the individual self. The instrument is the mind. It is not stated in the scriptures, that the mind is produced from the individual self. The scriptural text is this—' From Him, is produced the breath, the mind and all the sense-organs ' (*Muṇḍ*. II-1-3).

41. *Vijñānādibhāve vā tadapratiṣedhaḥ*

Or,[1] if they are held to be the Lord, who is knowledge and the origin, there is no contradiction to that system.

[1] Here the term ' or ' sets aside the view of the opponent, mentioned in the previous Sūtras.

"वासुदेवात्संकर्षणो नाम जीवः" इत्यादौ संकर्षणादीनां विज्ञानादिरूपवासुदेवत्वे सति, तदभिधायिनः प्रामाण्यानिषेधः[1] । [2]परब्रह्मभूतवासुदेवस्य श्रुतावपि "अजायमानो बहुधा विजायते" [3]इतीच्छावतारः श्रूयते । जीवादिशब्दास्तत्तच्छरीरकसंकर्षणादीनां वाचकाः ॥

विप्रतिषेधाच्च ॥ ४२ ॥

तस्मिन्नपि तन्त्रे—

"व्याप्तिरूपेण संबन्धस्तस्याश्च पुरुषस्य च ।
स ह्यनादिरनन्तश्च परमार्थेन निश्चितः ॥"

Consider the statement—'From *Vāsudeva*, there originates the individual self, called *Saṁkarṣaṇa*'. Here *Saṁkarṣaṇa* and others are said to be *Vāsudeva* whose essential characteristic is knowledge, and who is the origin of the world. Then there can be no refutation of the authoritativeness of the doctrine, that set forth this truth. That the Supreme *Brahman Vāsudeva* takes the incarnation on His own will, is said in the scriptural text. 'He is unborn; Yet is born as many' (*Tait. Ār.* III-13-1). The words, Jīva etc.' denote *Saṁkarṣaṇa* and others, who are encased in those particular bodies.

42. *Vipratiṣedhācca*

And on account of the refutation.

Even in that system occurs this passage—The connection between her (*Prakṛti*) and the self is in the form of inseparability. The self is known truly to be without beginning

[1] अप्रतिषेधः A 1, M 1. [2] भूत omitted A 1, Pr.
[3] इति चावतारः M 1, Pr.

इति जीवोत्पत्तिप्रतिषेधाच्चाविरोधः श्रुत्या[1] ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे द्वितीयस्या-
ध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः

---

and end'. Thus the origination of the individual selves is refuted in that system. Thus there is no contradiction with the *Vedic* teaching.

THUS ENDS THE 2ND PĀDA OF THE 2ND ADHYĀYA.

---

[1] श्रुतः Pr.

द्वितीयाध्याये तृतीयः पादः

वियदधिकरणम् १

न वियदश्रुतेः ॥ १ ॥

वियन्नोत्पद्यते, अश्रुतेः । श्रुतिः श्रवणम् । निरवयवस्यात्मन इवोत्पत्तिश्रवणासंभवात् ॥

अस्ति तु ॥ २ ॥

ADHYĀYA II, PĀDA III

VIYADADHIKARAṆA 1

1. *Na viyadaśruteḥ*

The spatial ether is not produced on account of the non-hearing of its production.

The spatial ether is not generated, because there are not heard the scriptural statements on its production. It is not possible to hear from the scriptures the origination of it which has no parts, just as in the case of the self.

2. *Asti tu*

But there is hearing about the production of the spatial ether.

श्रवणं [1]संभवत्येव—"[2]आत्मन आकाशः संभूतः" इत्येव हि श्रुतिरतीन्द्रियार्थविषया[3] वियदुत्पत्तिं प्रतिपादयति । [4]आत्मनः "न जायते" इति प्रतिषेधादनुत्पत्तिः ॥

गौण्यसंभवाच्छब्दाच्च ॥ ३ ॥

"तत्तेजोऽसृजत" इति तेजःप्राथम्यवचनात् "आकाशः संभूतः" इति [5]श्रुतिर्गौणी । "वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं चैतदमृतम्" इति शब्दाच्च ॥

It is heard that the spatial ether is a product. Indeed, the very same scriptural text, which treats of the objects, that are beyond the congnizance of the sense-organs declares that the spatial ether is a product—'The Spatial ether is produced from the self' (*Taiṭ.* II-1-2) But the individual self is known not produced because the scriptural statement 'He is not born' (*Kaṭh.* I-2-18).

3. *Gauṇyasaṁbhavācchabdācca*

The scriptural text here, has a secondary meaning, on account of the impossibility and of the verbal authority.

Fire is mentioned as the first product in the text, 'It sent forth fire' (*Chānd.* VI-2-3). Hence, the text, 'The spatial ether is produced' (*Taiṭ.* II-1-2), is to be taken in the secondary sense. It is so also because there is the text, 'The wind and the spatial ether. This is Immortal' (*Bṛh.* II-3-3).

[1] भवत्येव M 1.
[2] आत्मनः omitted M 1, 2. Pr
[3] विषयतया M 2.
[4] आत्मनोऽपि M 1, 2. Pr.
[5] श्रुतिः omitted M 1, 2.

स्याच्चैकस्य ब्रह्मशब्दवत् ॥ ४ ॥

एकस्य संभूतशब्दस्याकाशे गौणत्वमन्यत्र मुख्यत्वं [1]त्वनुषङ्गे संभवत्येव, श्रवणावृत्तिवत् । यथैकस्य ब्रह्मशब्दस्य "तस्मादेतद् ब्रह्म नाम रूपमन्नं च जायते" इति प्रकृतौ गौणत्वम्; "तपसा चीयते ब्रह्म" इति मुख्यत्वमावृत्तौ ॥

परिहरति—

प्रतिज्ञाहानिरव्यतिरेकात् ॥ ५ ॥

4. *Syāccaikasya Brahmaśabdavat*

A word may be used in different senses, as in the case of the word, *Brahman.*

The word, *Sambhūta* is used in a secondary sense with reference to the spatial ether, and in its original sense with reference to other objects. This discrimination is quite possible when the same word is referred to in a further text, just as in the case of the word which is actually uttered in other place. Consider the following for instance—The word, *Brahman,* is used in the secondary sense in the text, 'From Him is born this *Brahman*, name, form and food' (*Mund.* I-10). Here the word *Brahman* denotes the *Prakṛti* in the secondary sense. But in other text it is used in the primary sense; *vide* 'The *Brahman* swells on His thought' (*Mund.* I-9).

This view is refuted thus—

5. *Pratijñāhānir avyatirekāt*

The non-abandonment of the Pratijñā (proposition) results from non-difference.

[1] त्वनुषङ्गे omitted M 1; तु omitted Pr.

"येनाश्रुतं श्रुतम्" इत्यादिनैकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानप्रतिज्ञाया [1]अहानिर्वियदादेर्ब्रह्मकार्यत्वेन तदव्यतिरेकादेव ॥

शब्देभ्यः ॥ ६ ॥

"आकाशः संभूतः" इत्यादिशब्देभ्योऽवगतां वियदुत्पत्तिं "तत्तेजोऽसृजत" इत्यत्राकाशशब्दावचनावगतं तेजःप्राथम्यं न [2]निवारयितुं क्षमम् ॥

यावद्विकारं तु विभागो लोकवत् ॥ ७ ॥

The proposition, mentioned in the scriptural text, 'By hearing on whom, the unheard becomes heard' is this—'The knowledge of one produces the knowledge of all'. This proposition is not discarded, because the spatial ether etc. are the effects produced by the *Brahman* and they are not different from Him.

6. *S'abdebhyaḥ*

This follows from other texts.

The scriptural text, *namely*, 'The ether is produced' makes one understand that the spatial ether is created. This statement cannot be over-ridden by the absense of the word '*Ākās'a*' in the text, 'He produced the fire', which declares that the fire was the first among the creatures.

7. *Yāvadvikāraṁ tu vibhāgo lokavat*

But the division (*i.e.* origination) extends over all effects as in popular worldly usage.

[1] अहानिः omitted M 2. [2] नि omitted M 1.

"ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वम्" इत्यादिनाकाशादेरपि विकारत्वावगमात्, तेजःप्रभृतिविभागवचनं सर्वस्य प्रदर्शनार्थमिति निश्चीयते; [1]यथा लोके "दशेमे देवदत्तपुत्राः" इत्युक्त्वा तेषु केषांचिदुत्पत्तिवचनम् ॥

एतेन मातरिश्वा व्याख्यातः ॥ ८ ॥

"तेजोऽतः" इत्यादि वक्तुं वायोः पृथगुपादानम् ॥

असंभवस्तु सतोऽनुपपत्तेः ॥ ९ ॥

The spatial ether, etc. undergo modifications, as stated in the text, 'All this has Him as the Self' (*Chānd.* VI-8-7). What has been determined here is this—'The statements made as regards the creation of fire, etc. are intended to include also the creation of all other creatures. In the popular usage, some one has said first, 'All these ten are the sons of *Devadatta*'. Then he mentions some of them as born from *Devadatta*.

8. *Etena Mātariśvā vyākhyātaḥ*

Hereby the wind becomes explained (as an effect).

The wind is separately mentioned here so that it may be referred to in the further *Sūtras* II-3-10 and so on.

9. *Asaṁbhavastu satonupapatteḥ*

The non-origination is for that existence only, because of its impossibility in other cases.

[1] यथा च Pr.

असंभवस्तु परस्य ब्रह्मण एव । इतरस्य "सदेव" इत्यवधारणाद्यनुपपत्तेरुत्पत्तिरेव ॥

तेजोऽधिकरणम् २

[1]आकाशादिव्यवहितकार्याणामपि साक्षाद्ब्रह्मण उत्पत्तिं वक्तुं पूर्वपक्षमाह—

तेजोऽतस्तथा ह्याह ॥ १० ॥

तेजो [2]वायोरेवोत्पद्यते, न साक्षाद्ब्रह्मणः । "वायोरग्निः" इति ह्याह[3] ॥

The impossibility of the production is only in the case of the *Brahman*. The objects, other than the *Brahman*, are created, because there is in the text 'existence only' (*Chānd.* VI-2-2) the word *Eva* (only) excluding others.

TEJODHIKARAṆA 2

The effects that are said to have been produced with the mediation of the ether etc. are produced directly by the *Brahman*. To establish this truth, the *Sūtrakāra* raises the following objections to answer—

10. *Tejotastathāhyāha*

Fire is produced thence, for thus the scripture declares.

The fire is originated from the wind alone and not directly from the *Braman*, because the scriptural text states thus—'From wind the fire is produced' (*Tait.* I-2-1-2).

[1] Pr. omits this introductory passage. [2] एव omitted M 1.
[3] हि omitted M 1. Pr.

आपः ॥ ११ ॥

"अग्नेरापः" इति श्रुतेरापोऽग्नेः ॥

पृथिवी ॥ १२ ॥

पृथिव्यद्भ्यः, "अद्भ्यः पृथिवी" इति श्रुतेः ॥

अधिकाररूपशब्दान्तरेभ्यः ॥ १३ ॥

"ता अन्नमसृजन्त" इत्यन्नशब्देन पृथिव्येवाभिधीयते, [1]भूत-

11. *Apaḥ*

Water originates from fire.

Water originates from fire as stated in the text, 'From fire the water' (*Tait.* I-2-1-2).

12. *Pṛthivī*

The earth originates from water.

The earth is produced from water. The scriptural text in support of this is this—'From water the earth' (*Tait.* I-2-1-2).

13. *Adhikārarūpaśabdāntarebhyaḥ*

Earth alone is referred to, on account of the context, the colour, and other texts.

The word 'food' mentioned in the text, 'They created the food' (*Chānd.* VI-2-4), denotes the earth only; because of the context of the creation of the elements. The earth is

[1] महाभूत M 3. Pr.

सृष्ट्यधिकारात्; "यत्कृष्णं तदन्नस्य" इति पृथिवीरूपविधानात्, "अद्भ्यः पृथिवी" इति पृथिवीशब्दाच्च[1] ॥

राद्धान्तमाह—

तदभिध्यानादेव तु तल्लिङ्गात् सः ॥ १४ ॥

"तत्तेज ऐक्षत" "ता आप ऐक्षन्त" इति तदभिध्यानरूपात् "तदैक्षत बहु स्याम्" इत्येतत्सरूपात्[2] परमात्मकारणत्वलिङ्गात् स एव परमात्मा तेजःप्रभृतिशरीरकस्तत्तच्छब्दैः साक्षात्कारणत्वेनाभिधीयते ॥

stated to have a colour in the scriptural text 'That which is black is of the food' (*Chānd.* VI 4-1) The word 'earth,' is mentioned in the text, 'The earth springs forth from water' (*Tait.* I-2-1-2).

Here the conclusive answer of the objection is this—

14. *Tadabhidhyānādeva tu tallingāt saḥ*

But He is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world; because there are indicative marks *namely* His contemplation.

There is the expression in the phrases, 'The fire thought' (*Chānd.* VI-2-3) and 'The water, thought' (*Chānd.* VI-2-4) which resemble more or less the other text 'That thought may I become many' and furnish the token of the universal cause *i.e.* Highest Self. This text proves that the Highest Self is the direct cause of the creation, etc. of the world; because He has fire etc. as His body and is denoted by the words fire etc.

[1] शब्दाभिधानाच्च Pr. [2] स्वरूपात् Pr.

विपर्ययेण तु क्रमोऽत उपपद्यते च ॥ १५ ॥

पारंपर्यक्रमात् विपर्ययेण "एतस्माज्जायते प्राणः खं वायुर्ज्योतिरापः[1]" इत्यादिवाक्याद्यः साक्षाद्ब्रह्मणः सृष्टिरूपः क्रमः[2] सोऽप्यतस्तेजःप्रभृतिशरीरकब्रह्मण एव सृष्टेरुपपद्यते ॥

अन्तरा विज्ञानमनसी क्रमेण तल्लिङ्गादिति चेत्; न, अविशेषात् ॥ १६ ॥

15. *Viparyayeṇa tu kramota upapadyate ca*

The contrariety of the order of succession is possible, only if the origination of all effect is from Him (the *Brahman*).

The order of succession in a different form is stated in the scriptural text, 'From Him is produced the vital wind, the spatial ether, wind, fire and water' (*Kath.* II-1-3). From this statement it is clear that the creation proceeds direct from the *Brahman*. Therefore it follows that the creation proceeds from the *Brahman*, who has fire, etc. as His body.

16. *Antarā vijñānamanasī krameṇa talliṅgāditi cet, na, aviśeṣāt*

If it be said that knowledge (sense-organs) and mind, which are mentioned between the vital wind and the elements are stated in order of succession,

[1] ज्योतिरापः omitted M 1, 2. [2] सृष्टिरूपक्रमः Pr.

भूतप्राणयोरन्तराले इन्द्रियग्राममनसी क्रमेणोत्पद्येते इत्येतत्परमिदं वाक्यम्—"खं वायुर्ज्योतिरापः" इत्यादि, श्रुत्यन्तरप्राप्तक्रमप्रत्यभिज्ञानरूपाल्लिङ्गात्[1] । अत इदमपि पारंपर्यक्रमपरमिति चेत्; न, "एतस्माज्जायते" इत्यस्य प्राणादिपृथिव्यन्तेषु सर्वेषु प्रत्येकमन्वयाविशेषात् । अतस्तेजःप्रभृतीनामपि साक्षात्परमात्मैव कारणम् ॥

"तत्तेज ऐक्षत" इति तेजःप्रभृतिशब्दा लोके तत्तद्वस्तुवाचिनो ब्रह्मणि भाक्ता इत्यत्राह—

owing to the particular mark; we say, not so, on account of non-difference.

That between the vital wind (*Prāna*) and elements are produced the sense-organs and mind, is taught in the text—'The spatial ether, the wind, the fire and the water,' (*Muṇd.* II-1-3), because the recognition of the order mentioned in the other *S'ruti* passage. Therefore this text also states the creation in certain order with mediation. It is not so; because the statement, 'From Him is produced' (*Muṇd.* II-1-3), is common in regard to the creation of the substances beginning with the vital-wind and ending with the earth. Therefore the Highest Self only is the direct cause of fire, etc.

In the statements 'The fire thought, etc.' the words, Fire, etc., refer to the well-known popular fire etc. They are used in secondary sense in the case of the *Brahman*. To this objection the reply is stated thus :—

[1] श्रुतिप्रत्यभिज्ञानरूपाल्लिङ्गात् A 1. Pr,

चराचरव्यपाश्रयस्तु स्यात्तद्व्यपदेशो-
ऽभाक्तस्तद्भावभावित्वात् ॥ १७ ॥

चराचरवस्तुसंबन्धी तत्तद्वाचकः शब्दो[1] ब्रह्मण्यभाक्तो मुख्य एव, "अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि" [2]इति सर्वस्य वस्तुनो नामरूपभाक्त्वस्यात्मतया ब्रह्मानुप्रवेशभावभावित्वात् । लौकिकास्त्वेवमजानन्तो वाच्यैकदेशे प्रयुञ्जते ॥

17. *Carācaravyapāśrayastu syāt tadvyapadeśobhāktastadbhāvabhāvitvāt*

But the terms which are connected with the things movable and immovable, *i.e.* denoting those things, are non-secondary (*i.e.* of primary denotative power, with regard to the *Brahman*); since their denotative power is effected by the being of that *Brahman.*

Those terms which are connected with things movable and immovable, *i e.* the terms denoting those things, refer to the *Brahman* in the non-secondary sense, *i e.* in the primary sense. According to the scriptural text 'Let me enter as the soul and separate out name and form' (*Chānd.* VI-3-2) the *Brahman* enters all the things as their soul and gives them separate names and forms. But the people ignorant of this, use the words in a portion of their full meaning.

[1] वाची शब्दः M 2. [2] इति तु Pr,

आत्माधिकरणम् ३

नात्मा श्रुतेर्नित्यत्वाच्च ताभ्यः ॥ १८ ॥

नात्मोत्पद्यते, "न जायते म्रियते" इति श्रुतेः; "नित्यो नित्यानाम्" इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यो नित्यत्वावगतेश्च ॥

ज्ञाधिकरणम् ४

ज्ञोऽत एव ॥ १९ ॥

"अथ यो वेदेदं जिघ्राणीति स आत्मा" "मनसैतान् कामान्

ĀTMĀDHIKARAṆA 3

18. *Nātmā s'ruternityatvācca tābhyaḥ*

The self is not born ; because he is thus heard from the scriptural texts and on account of eternity, which results from them.

The self is not born, because we hear Him unborn from the scriptural statement, 'He is neither born nor dead' (*Kaṭh.* I-2-18). He is also apprehended to be eternal ; because there are the texts, 'Eternal among the eternals' (*S'vet.* VI-13) etc.

JÑĀDHIKARANA 4

19. *Jñota eva*

For the same reason, the individual self is invariably the knower.

The self, either in the state of bondage or in the state of *Mukti* (i.e. final release), is invariably the knower. Thus he is heard from the scriptural text, 'Now, he who knows, 'let me smell this' 'he is the self' (*Chānd.* VIII-12-4). 'He,

पश्यन् रमते य एते ब्रह्मलोके" इत्यादिश्रुतेर्बद्धो मुक्तश्चात्मा ज्ञातैव ।
"मनोऽस्य [1]दिव्यं चक्षुः" इति श्रुतेः स्वधर्मभूतं ज्ञानं मनः ॥

उत्क्रान्तिगत्यागतीनाम् ॥ २० ॥

[2]उत्क्रान्तिगत्यागतीनां श्रुतेरणुर्जीवः ॥

स्वात्मना चोत्तरयोः ॥ २१ ॥

गत्यागत्योः स्वात्मनैव संपाद्यत्वादप्यणुत्वं निश्चितम् ॥

with the mind, sees these desires and experiences enjoyment of them that are related to the *Brahman-world*' (*Chānd.* VIII-12-5). Here by the word 'mind' is meant the knowledge that is his essential characteristic as stated in the text 'The mind is his divine eye' (*Chānd.* VIII-12-5).

20. *Utkrāntigatyāgatīnām*

And on account of his going up, moving and returning.

The individual selves are atomic in size; because the scriptures state that they go up leaving the body, that they move and that they return to the body.

21. *Svātmanā cottarayoḥ*

And on account of the latter two being effected through his very self.

The moving and the returning must be taken as effected by the self himself. Hence the individual selves are determined to be atomic in size.

[1] दैवं Pr.　　[2] अत्र added before M 1.

नाणुरतच्छ्रुतेरिति चेत्; न, इतराधिकारात् ॥ २२ ॥

"स वा एष महानज आत्मा" इति श्रुतेर्नाणुरिति चेत्; न, "यस्यानुवित्तः प्रतिबुद्ध आत्मा" इति परमात्माधिकारात् ॥

स्वशब्दोन्मानाभ्यां च ॥ २३ ॥

"एषोऽणुरात्मा" इत्यणुशब्दात् "आराग्रमात्रो ह्यवरः" इत्युद्धृत्य [1]मानाच्चाणुरात्मा ॥

22. *Nāṇuratacchruteriti cenna, itarādhikārāt*

If it be said that the individual selves are not atomic in size, on account of the scriptural statement of what is not that; we say no, on account of the other's being in the topic.

The individual selves are not atomic in size; because there is the scriptural text, 'Verily He is infinite, unborn Self' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-22) This is not so, because the context refers to the Highest Self. This is seen in the text, 'By whom this Self is understood and meditated' (*Bṛh.* VI-4-13).

23. *Svaśabdonmānābhyāṁ ca*

And on account of the use of the word referring to him and his measurement.

The word 'atomic' is used in the scriptural text, 'This self of atomic size' (*Mund.* III-1-9). In another text the self is described thus—'He is of the size of the point of a goad or even subtler than it' (*S've.* V-9). Hence the self is atomic in size.

[1] उन्मानशब्दाच्च Pr.

अणोरपि सकलदेहव्यापिवेदनानुभवेऽन्यमतेन हेतुमाह—

अविरोधश्चन्दनवत् ॥ २४ ॥

यथा [1]चन्दनबिन्दुर्देहैकदेशस्थोऽपि सकलदेहव्यापि सुखं जनयति, तद्वदविरोधः ॥

अवस्थितिवैशेष्यादिति चेत्; न, अभ्युपगमाद्धृदि हि ॥ २५ ॥

The self, who is atomic in size, experiences the sensations extending over the whole of the body. In this regard the arguments advanced by other school of thought are thus—

24. *Avirodhas'candanavat*

There is no contradiction, taking the case of the sandal-ointment for instance

A drop of sandal-ointment, although applied to one spot of the body, produces the refreshing sensation extending all over the body. Same is the case with the self also. Hence no contradiction arises.

25. *Avasthitivais'eṣyāditi cenna, abhyupagamāddhṛdi hi*

Should it be said that the case is different on account of specialisation of abode; we say no, on account of the acknowledgment (of a place for the self, *viz.* the heart).

[1] हरिचन्दनबिन्दुर्देहैकदेशवर्त्यप्यणुरपि M 1.

[1]देहदेशविशेषस्थितेश्चन्दनस्येति चेत्; न, आत्मनोऽपि तदभ्युपगमात्, हृदि ह्ययमात्मा, "योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु हृद्यन्तर्ज्योतिः" इति श्रुतेः ॥

स्वमतेनाह—

गुणाद्वालोकवत् ॥ २६ ॥

आत्मा स्वगुणेन ज्ञानेन सकलदेहं व्याप्यानुभवति, यथा मणिप्रभृतयः स्वकीयेनालोकेन [2]सकलदेशं व्याप्य प्रकाशयन्ति, "प्रज्ञामात्रास्वर्पिताः" इति श्रुतेः[3] ॥

If it be said that the case is different, because the drop of the sandal-ointment is in contact with a definite part of the body; we say—this is not so; because the self also abides in a part of the body. It is an accepted fact that the self abides in the heart. In support of this statement, there is the following scriptural passage 'He who is within the heart, among the *Prāṇas*, the person of light consisting of knowledge' (*Bṛh.* IV. 3-7).

The author states his own view thus:—

26. *Guṇādvālokavat*

Or through his quality, like the light.

The self experiences happiness by pervading the whole of the body through knowledge, which is his attribute. This is similar to a gem, etc. that enlighten all the space pervading through their own light. Thus the scriptural text says

[1] देश omitted A 1, देह omitted Pr. [2] सकलदेशं omitted A 1, M 2.
[3] श्रुत्युक्तेः A 1.

न [1]ज्ञानात्मनोर्व्यतिरेक इत्यत्राह—

व्यतिरेको गन्धवत्; तथाच दर्शयति ॥ २७ ॥

'गन्धवती पृथिवी' इतिवत् 'अहं जानामि' इति गुणत्वेनोपलब्धेर्व्यतिरेकोऽस्ति । दर्शयति च श्रुतिर्व्यतिरेकम्—"जानात्येवायं पुरुषः" इति ॥

पृथगुपदेशात् ॥ २८ ॥

'The elements of being are fixed on the elements of intellegence' (*Kaus.* III-9).

On the objection that the knowledge and the self are not distinct entities from each other, the answer is stated thus:—

27. *Vyatireko gandhavat*; *tathāca darśayati*

There is distinction as in the case of the smell; thus scripture declares.

There is distinction between the knowledge and the self; because the knowledge is apprehended as the attribute of the self, in the notion, 'I know'. This is similar to the smell, which is known as a quality of the earth by the notion 'the earth has the smell'. The scriptural text, *namely*, 'This person knows' also proves this,

28. *Pṛthagupadeśāt*

It is so on account of the scriptural statement as different.

[1] ज्ञानाद्आत्मनः M 1.

यावदात्मभावित्वाच्च न दोषस्तद्दर्शनात् ॥ ३० ॥

आत्मस्वरूपानुबन्धित्वात् ज्ञानस्य, तेन व्यपदेशे[1] न दोषः। स्वरूपानुबन्धिधर्मत्वेन गोत्वादीनां खण्डादेर्गौरित्यादिव्यपदेशो हि दृश्यते ॥

सुषुप्त्यादिष्वसतो ज्ञानस्य यावदात्मभावित्वं कथमित्यत्राह—

पुंस्त्वादिवत्त्वस्य सतोऽभिव्यक्तियोगात् ॥ ३१ ॥

30. *Yāvadātmabhāvitvācca na doṣastaddarśanāt*

No mistake arises in such designation, since the quality of knowledge exists in the self, as long as the self exists; this is so observed in the scriptural text.

No mistake arises, when the self is designated as the knowledge; because that knowledge is seen through out as the essential nature of the self. Indeed, it is seen that a cow with broken horns is designated as cow, on account of its particular characteristic appearing through out as its essential nature.

How could it be said that the knowledge is always associated with the self as long as he exists, when it is absent in him at the state of deep sleep (*i.e. Suṣupti*)?

In reply it is stated thus:—

31. *Puṁstvādivattvasya satobhivyaktiyogāt*

Since there may be the manifestation of that which has been already in existence, as in the case of the virile power, etc.

[1] व्यपदेशो M 2.

सुषुप्त्यादिषु सतो ज्ञानस्यानभिव्यक्तस्यापि जागरादावभिव्यक्ति-संभवात् स्वरूपानुबन्ध्येव ज्ञानम् । यथा पुंस्त्वासाधारणसप्तमधातोर्बाल्येऽपि सतो युवत्वेऽभिव्यक्तिः ॥

नित्योपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धिप्रसङ्गोऽन्यतरनियमो वान्यथा ॥ ३२ ॥

जीवात्मनो ज्ञातृत्वमणुत्वं चोक्तम्; [1]अन्यथा ज्ञप्तिमात्रसर्वगतात्म-वादे[2] तावन्नित्यवत् सर्वदोपलब्धिः स्यात्, [3]संकोचकाभावात् । विद्यमानाया

The knowledge, that is in existense does not manifest itself in the deep sleep (*Susupti*) etc. But it manifests itself in the waking state etc. Therefore the knowledge is certainly the essential nature of the self. This is similar to the virile power, which is the seventh of the elementary substances forming the body and is peculiar to males.[4] It manifests itself only in the youth though it was in existence even in the boyhood.

32. *Nityopalabdhyanupalabdhiprasaṅgonyatarani-yamo vānyathā*

Otherwise there would result permanent consciousness or non-consciousness, or else limitative restriction to either.

It has been stated that the self is the knower and is atomic in size. Otherwise, if he is viewed as being mere knowledge and omnipresent, then consciousness would permanently take place always, because there is no reason for

[1] अन्यथा omitted M 2, 3, Pr. [2] सर्वगतत्ववादे M 2.

[3] संकोचे कारणाभावात् । अविद्यमानायाः M 1.

[4] The seven elementary substances of the human body are—blood, humour, flesh, fat, marrow, bone and semon.

अनुपलब्धेरपि सैव हेतुरिति सापि नित्यवत् स्यात्; ज्ञाने विद्यमानेऽपि[1] हेत्वन्तरेण निवारणासंभवात्। आगन्तुकज्ञानसर्वगतात्मवादेऽपि स एव दोषः, सर्वात्मनां सर्वगतत्वेन ज्ञानहेतूनां मनःसंयोगादीनां सर्वसाधारणत्वात्। अदृष्टहेतूनामपि सर्वसाधारणत्वात्तेनापि न नियमः[2]। अथोपलब्ध्यनुपलब्ध्योर्विरोधादुपलब्धेर्वैते हेतवः स्युरनुपलब्धेर्वा, तथा सत्यन्यतरनियमः स्यात्॥

कर्त्रधिकरणम् ५

कर्ता शास्त्रार्थवत्त्वात्॥ ३३॥

restriction. By following the same line of argument, the non-consciousness also would always take place. When the knowledge is apprehended, it cannot be prevented by other reasons. The same mistakes arise in the school, that accepts the self is identical with knowledge that arises occasionally and is omnipresent. All the selves are extant everywhere. What is common to all these selves is that the knowledge is produced when they are brought in contact with the mind (*Manas*) and so on. Nor it cannot be restricted by *Adṛṣṭa*, because it is produced in all the individual selves. If it is argued that consciousness and non-consciousness are opposed to each other and therefore it may cause consciousness or non-consciousness only. In that case either consciousness or non-consciousness only will necessarily take place.

KARTRADHIKARANA 5

33. *Kartā śāstrārthavattvāt*

The self is doer, on account of the scripture having a purpose to be served.

[1] अपि omitted A 1, M 2. [2] तन्नियमः A 1.

ज्ञाता सन्नयमात्मा कर्मसु कर्ता च । आत्मनोऽकर्तृत्वे 'कुर्यात्, न कुर्यात्' इति शास्त्रानर्थक्यं स्यात् ॥

उपादानाद्विहारोपदेशाच्च ॥ ३४ ॥

"प्राणान् गृहीत्वा स्वे शरीरे यथाकामं परिवर्तते" इत्युपादानविहारोपदेशाच्च कर्ता ॥

व्यपदेशाच्च क्रियायाम्; न चेन्निर्देशविपर्ययः ॥ ३५ ॥

Besides being the knower, the self is also the doer of actions. If the self is not the doer the scriptures enjoining 'one should do this or should not do this' will become meaningless.

34. *Upādānād vihāropadeśācca*

On account of the declaration of his taking and moving about.

'The self taking with him the senses, moves around in his own body, according to his will and pleasure' (*Bṛh.* II-1-18). This text teaches that the self is active in taking the senses and in moving. Therefore he is the doer.

35. *Vyapadeśācca kriyāyām* ; *nacennirdeśa-viparyayaḥ*

And on account of the designation of the self as the doer of actions. If not so, the word would have been used in different way.

"विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते। कर्माणि तनुतेऽपि च[1]" इत्यादिना यज्ञादौ कर्तृत्वव्यपदेशाच्च कर्ता। विज्ञानशब्दो बुद्धेः, नात्मन इति चेत्; तन्न,[2] तदा विज्ञानेनेति निर्देशविपर्ययः स्यात्, बुद्धेः करणत्वात्॥

उपलब्धिवदनियमः॥ ३६॥

प्रकृतेरेव कर्तृत्वे तस्याः सर्वसाधारणत्वेन पूर्वोक्तोपलब्ध्यनियमवत् फलानियमः स्यात्॥

शक्तिविपर्ययात्॥ ३७॥

The self is doer; because he is designated as an agent performing sacrifice etc. in the scriptural text, 'Knowledge (*Vijnāna*) perfoims the sucrifice, and does the actions also' (*Tait.* I-2-5). If it is argued that the word, *Vijnāna* means *Buddhi* (understanding) and not the self, it is not so. In that case the word *Vijñāna* should have been used with differcnt case-affix, *namely*, *Vijnānena* (by understanding), because *Buddhi* is only the instrument.

36. *Upalabdivadaniyamaḥ*

There would be no any definite rule, as in the case of consciousness.

In the case that the *Prakṛti* alone is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world, as this is common to all the selves, there would be no definite rule, as regards the distribution of results. This is similar to the case of no rule being fixed as regards the consciousness as mentioned above.

37. *S'aktiviparyayāt*

On account of the inversion of power.

[1] कर्माणि etc omitted A 1, M 1, Pr. [2] न A 1, Pr.

प्रकृतेरेव कर्तृत्वे, कर्तुरेव भोक्तृत्वमिति सैव भोक्त्री स्यादित्यर्थः ॥

समाध्यभावाच्च ॥ ३८ ॥

प्रकृतेरेव कर्तृत्वे 'प्रकृतेरन्योऽस्मि' इति समाध्यभावप्रसङ्गाच्च ॥

यथा च तक्षोभयथा ॥ ३९ ॥

आत्मनः कर्तृत्वे 'इच्छाया करोति, अन्यथा न करोति' इति व्यवस्था च सिध्यति; यथा तक्षा स्वकार्येषु । बुद्धेरिच्छाभावान्न व्यवस्था, चेतनधर्मत्वादिच्छायाः ॥

Suppose the *Pradhāna* is the doer. Then the power of enjoyment also must belong to it as there is a rule, *namely*, that the doer only must be enjoyer of the effect. The meaning is that the *Prakrti* will enjoy the fruits of the actions.

38. *Samādhyabhāvācca*

And on account of the absence of such a meditation.

Suppose the *Prakṛti* is the doer. Then the meditation with the conviction, 'I am other than the *Prakṛti*' would not take place.

39. *Yathā ca takṣobhayathā*

And then only, both the alternatives are possible as in the case of a carpenter.

Suppose the self is the doer. Then only the fact, *namely*, 'He does when he wishes and does not in other case' is possible to accept. This is similar to the case of a carpenter, regarding his work. This fact cannot be

परायत्ताधिकरणम् ६

परात्तु तच्छ्रुतेः ॥ ४० ॥

"य आत्मानमन्तरो यमयति" [1]इत्यादिश्रुतेरात्मनः कर्तृत्वं परायत्तम्; "सर्वस्य चाहं हृदि संनिविष्टो मत्तः स्मृतिर्ज्ञानमपोहनं च" इत्यादिस्मृतेश्च ॥

कृतप्रयत्नापेक्षस्तु, विहितप्रतिषिद्धावैयर्थ्यादिभ्यः ॥ ४१ ॥

acceptable in the case that the *Buddhi* is doer, because the desire is an attribute of sentient beings only.

PARĀYATTĀDHIKARANA 6

40. *Parāttu tacchruteḥ*

But, from the Highest, the self's action starts, this being declared in the scripture.

The activity of the individual selves proceeds from the Highest Self. This is stated in the scriptural text, 'He, who rules the self dwelling within (*Bṛh.* III-7-22 *Mādh.*). The *Smṛti* text also teaches the same—'And I am placed in the hearts of all. From me come memory, knowledge, and their loss also' (*Bhag. Gī.* XV-15).

41. *Kṛtaprayatnāpekṣastu vihitapratiṣiddhāvaiyarthyādibhyaḥ*

But, with a view to the efforts made, the Lord makes the individual selves act; on account of the non-meaninglessness of injunctions and prohibition and so on.

[1] आदि omitted M 2.

जीवः स्वेच्छया प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिहेतुभूतं[1] प्रयत्नं करोति ; जीवेन[2] कृतं प्रयत्नं [3]प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिहेतुमपेक्ष्य तदनुमतिदानेन परः प्रवर्तयतीति [4]विधिनिषेधावैयर्थ्यनिग्रहानुग्रहेभ्योऽवगम्यते । यथा गुरुतरदार्वादिहरणं[5] [6]दुर्बलः प्रबलसहकृतः कुर्वन्नपि स्वप्रयत्ने[7] विधिनिषेधयोग्यो भवति, एवमेव जीवः परमपुरुषानुमतिसहकृतः प्रवर्तमानोऽपि विधिनिषेधयोग्य इति न कश्चिद्विरोधः ॥

अंशाधिकरणम् ७

अंशो नानाव्यपदेशादन्यथा चापि दाशकितवादित्वमधीयत एके ॥ ४२ ॥

The individual selves do an act or abstain from doing it, out of their own will. Then the Highest Self taking into account the individual soul's effort resulting the activity and abstinence, aids the individual selves in their efferts by granting his permission. This fact is known from the non-meaninglessness of injunctions and prohibitions, punishment and favour of the Lord. A weak person cannot carry a heavy load of wood etc. himself Yet he carries the same with the help of a strong man and comes in the scope of the Vidhi (injunction) or Nisedha (prohibition) of the act In the same way the individual selves do an act with the permission of the Highest Self. Yet they become parties to the injunctions or prohibitions. Hence no contradiction arises.

AMS'ĀDHIKARANA 7

42. *Aṁs'o nānā vyapades'ādanyathā cāpi dās'akitavāditvamadhīyata eke*

The individual self forms a part of the *Brahman*,

[1] हेतुं A 1, M 2. [2] जीवेन तु A 1, Pr. [3] प्रथमप्रवृत्तिहेतुं A 1, Pr.
[4] तद्विधि M 3, Pr. [5] भरणं A 1, Pr. [6] अबलः M 3. Pr.
[7] स्वीयप्रयत्नेन Pr.

जीवात्मा [1]परमपुरुषांशः, "पृथगात्मानं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा" "स कारणं करणाधिपाधिपः" इत्यादिनानाव्यपदेशात् । अन्यथा च ; "तत्त्वमसि" "अयमात्मा ब्रह्म" इत्यैक्योपदेशाच्च[2] । "ब्रह्म दाशाः" इत्यादिना [3]सर्वजीवव्याप्त्यैक्यमधीयत एके । [4]अंशत्वाभ्युपगमे ह्युभयं मुख्यं भवति ॥

मन्त्रवर्णात् ॥ ४३ ॥

on account of the declaration of difference and otherwise; some also record that the *Brahman* is the fishermen, gamblers, and so on

The individual self is a part of the Highest Person. The scriptural texts, *namely* 'Knowing the individual self and the actuator to be different' (*S'vet* 1-6), and 'He is the cause, He is the lord of the lords of the senses' (*S'vet.* VI-9) indicate that the individual selves are different from the *Brahman*. Otherwise also that the *Brahman* is one with the individual self, has been stated in the texts, 'That thou art' (*Chānd.* VI-10-3) and 'This self is the *Brahman*' (*Brh.* IV-4-5) Some declare the oneness of the *Brahman* with the individual selves in the text, '*Brahman* are these fishermen etc.' (*Brahma-Sūkta*) because He is pervading all the individual selves. Both these statements (*i e*, difference and non-difference between the *Brahman* and the individual selves) become sensible in primary and original thought, when the individual selves are held to form the part of the *Brahman*.

43. *Mantravarṇāt*

On account of the wording of the *Mantra*, the individual self must be a part of the *Brahman*.

[1] परमात्मांशः A 1.
[2] ऐक्योपदेशः A 1, M 2
[3] सर्वजीवानामैक्यम् M 2, Pr.
[4] अंशत्वे ह्युमयं M 3.

"पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि" इति मन्त्रवर्णाच्च ॥

अपि स्मर्यते ॥ ४४ ॥

"ममैवांशो जीवलोके जीवभूतः सनातनः" इत्यादिना ॥

प्रकाशादिवत्तु नैवं परः ॥ ४५ ॥

ब्रह्मांशत्वेऽपि जीवस्य, जीवो यत्स्वरूपो यत्स्वभावश्च नैवं परः। किंतु निरवद्यः सर्वज्ञः सत्यसंकल्प एव सर्वदा[1]। कथम्? प्रकाशादिवत्; प्रकाशविशिष्टानां मणिप्रभृतीनां प्रकाशो विशिष्टैकदेशत्वेन यथांशः।

The individual selves must be the part of the *Brahman*, because there is the wording of the *mantra, namely*, 'One quarter of Him is represented by all the beings' (*Tait. Ār.* III-12-2).

44. *Api smaryate*

Moreover it is so stated in the *Smṛtis*.

The *Smṛtis* have stated thus 'The individual self is an eternal part of Myself, in the world of life' (*Bhag. Gī.* XV-7).

45. *Prakāśādivat tu naivaṁ paraḥ*

But it is as in the case of the light, etc. Not so is the case with the Highest Self.

Though the individual self is a part of the Highest self, the latter is not of the former's characteristics and nature. But the *Brahman* is always free from faults, is all-knowing, and is possessed with true will. How? As in the case of the light, etc. The light which emanates from the luminous gem, etc. is regarded as a part of gem etc. By the word,

[1] सदा M 2.

आदिशब्दाद्विशेषणतैकस्वभावजातिगुणशरीराणि गृह्यन्ते । विशेषणानां विशिष्टैकदेशतया तदंशत्वेऽपि विशेषणविशेष्ययोः स्वरूपस्वभावभेदो न विरुद्धः । "य आत्मनि तिष्ठन् यस्यात्मा शरीरम्" इति हि श्रुतिः ॥

स्मरन्ति च ॥ ४६ ॥

चिदचिदात्मकजगतो ब्रह्मांशत्वं प्रकाशादिवदिति पराशरादयः स्मरन्ति—

"एकदेशस्थितस्याग्नेर्ज्योत्स्ना विस्तारिणी यथा ।
परस्य ब्रह्मणः शक्तिस्तथेदमखिलं जगत् ॥"

"तत्सर्वं वै हरेस्तनुः" "तानि सर्वाणि तद्वपुः" इत्यादिषु ॥

'etcetera' are apprehended the class, quality and body, that are always known as adjectives. The adjectival attributes form the portions of the objects. Yet no contradiction arises, in regard to the difference in the essential nature and charactertistics between the objects and their adjectives. The scriptural text says thus—'He remains in the selves and has the selves for His body' (*Bṛh.* III-7-II *Mādhy*).

46. *Smaranti ca*

And the *Smṛti* texts declare thus.

Parās'ara and others declare that the world consisting of sentient and non-sentient beings is the part of the *Brahman* and this is similar to the case of the light. The *Smṛti* texts are these—'The fire is stationed in a place, but its light spreads all round. Thus is the whole world which is the power of the *Brahman*' (*Viṣ. Pu.* I-22-56). 'All those are Hari's body' (*Viṣ. Pu.* I-22-38). 'All those are His body' (*Vis. Pu.* I-22-86).

अनुज्ञापरिहारौ देहसंबन्धाज्ज्योतिरादिवत् ॥ ४७ ॥

ब्रह्मांशत्वेऽपि सर्वजीवानां कस्यचिद्वेदाध्ययनादावनुज्ञा, कस्यचित् परिहार इत्येतौ ब्राह्मणादिदेहविशेषसंबन्धादुपपद्येते, यथाग्न्यादेः श्रोत्रियागारश्मशानादिसंबन्धात् ॥

असंततेश्चाव्यतिकरः ॥ ४८ ॥

प्रतिदेहं भिन्नत्वादणुत्वेन तत्र तत्र [1]परिच्छिन्नत्वाच्च ज्ञानसुखाद्यव्यतिकरः । अज्ञानोपाधिभ्या ब्रह्मैव संबध्यत, इति पक्षद्वयेऽपि न तद्व्यवस्था ॥

47. *Anujñāparihārau dehasaṁbhandhājjyotirādivat*

Permission and prohibition result from the connection with the body, as in the case of the fire etc.

Though all the individual selves form the part of the *Brahman*, the permission and exclusion of some of them regarding the study of the vedas etc., are possible; because they are ordained in consideration of the connection of each individual self with a distinct body of *Brāhmana* etc. This discrimination is similar to the case of the fire in the *S'rotriya's* house or in the cremation ground.

48. *Asaṁtates'cāvyatikaraḥ*

And on account of the separateness of each self in each body, there is no confusion.

Each of the individual selves is separate in each body and is atomic in size. More over in each body he is limited. For this reason, there is no confusion in regard to the knowledge, happiness etc. This fact could not be maintained by

[1] विच्छिन्नत्वाच्च M 1.

आभासा एव च ॥ ४९ ॥

पक्षद्वयेऽपि हेतवश्चाभासाः ॥

अदृष्टानियमात् ॥ ५० ॥

सत्यमिथ्योपाधिकृतत्वेऽप्यात्मनां ब्रह्मण एवाज्ञानमुपाधिश्चेति [1]तत्त्कृतेनादृष्टादिनापि न नियमः ॥

अभिसंध्यादिष्वपि चैवम् ॥ ५१ ॥

the followers of the two schools, that connect the *Brahman* with ignorance or limiting conditions and hold that the *Brahman* gets the knowledge and happiness etc.

49. *Ābhāsā eva ca*

And the arguments also are wholly fallacious.

The arguments advanced in the other two schools are also fallacious.

50. *Adṛṣṭāniyamāt*

And there is no definite rule due to the *Adṛṣṭa*.

The *Brahman* alone becomes the seat of ignorance and limiting conditions, when the individual selves are said to have been effected by limiting conditions that may be either true or false. Hence there is no definite rule due to the *Adṛṣṭa* of the selves.

51. *Abhisaṁdhyādiṣvapi caivam*

And it is thus also in the case of the will, etc.

[1] तत्कृतेन M 1.

अदृष्टहेतुभूताभिसंध्यादिष्वपि चैवमेव ॥

प्रदेशभेदादिति चेन्नान्तर्भावात् ॥ ५२ ॥

उपाधिसंबन्धिब्रह्मप्रदेशभेदाद्व्यवस्थेति चेत्; न, उपाधिषु गच्छत्सु सर्वप्रदेशानां तदन्तर्भावात् ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे द्वितीयस्याध्यायस्य तृतीयः पादः ॥

For the same reason there can be no definite rule in the cases of the will, etc., which may cause the *Adṛṣṭa.*

52. *Prades'abedhāditi cennāntarbhāvāt*

Should it be said that this is possible owing to the difference of place; we deny this on account of the inclusion of all places in it.

Suppose it is stated that this is possible, as the *Brahman's* particular place due to a limiting condition becomes the individual self. It is not so; when the limiting adjuncts move about, all the places of the *Brahman* become the subject of limitation.

THUS ENDS THE 3RD PĀDA OF THE 2ND ADHYĀYA.

द्वितीयाध्याये चतुर्थः पादः

प्राणोत्पत्त्यधिकरणम् १

तथा प्राणाः ॥ १ ॥

यथा जीवोऽनुत्पत्तिनित्यत्वश्रुतेर्नोत्पद्यते[1] तथेन्द्रियाण्यपि; "असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्। ऋषयो वाव तेऽग्रेऽसदासीत्। प्राणा वा ऋषयः[2]" इति प्रलयकाले प्राणानां स्थित्युपदेशात् ॥

ADHYĀYA II, PĀDA IV

PRĀNOTPATTYADHIKARANA 1

1. *Tathā Prāṇāḥ*

Thus the *Prāṇas* (sense-organs) also are not created.

The individual selves are not created; because there are scriptural texts to prove that they are not produced and they are eternal. Same is the case with the sense-organs also. It is taught in the scriptures that, at the time of the *Pralaya* (the deluge), the *Prānas* did exist. The scriptural text is this—'The non-being (*Asat*) alone was in the beginning. Those sages in the beginning were, indeed, the *Asat* (*i.e.*

[1] जीवोत्पत्तिर्नित्यत्वश्रुतेर्नोपपद्यते A 1, M 1. Pr.

[2] माध्यन्दिनीयशतपथब्राह्मणे षष्ठकाण्डप्रथमप्रपाठकारम्भे पठ्यते—"असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्। तदाहुः। के तदसदासीदिति। ऋषयो वाव तेऽग्रेऽसदासीत्। तदाहुः। के त ऋषय

नैवम्,

गौण्यसंभवात् तत्प्राक्छ्रुतेश्च[1] ॥ २ ॥

तस्य परमात्मन एव सृष्टेः प्रागवस्थानश्रुतेः ऋषिशब्दः प्राणशब्दश्च परमात्मन्येव । [2]बहुत्वासंभवाद्बहुवचनश्रुतिर्गौणी ॥

non-being). The *Prānas* were those sages' (*S'atapatha-Brā.* (*Mādhya*), *Kānda* VI. *Prapā.* I. *Hymn.* I).

It is not so.

2. Gouṇyasaṁbhavāt tatprākchrutes'ca

The plural number is to be considered in a secondary sense; because it cannot be in the primary sense and since the Highest Self alone is declared to have an existence before the creation.

There are scriptural texts to show that the Highest Self alone was in existence before creation. The words 'sages' and '*Prānas*' refer to the Highest Self only Because He cannot be designated with a word in plural number, in the scriptural statement the plural number is to be considered as used instead of the singular number in a secondary sense.

इति। प्राणा वा ऋषयस्ते यत्पुरास्मात्सर्वस्मादिदमिच्छन्तः श्रमेण तपसारिषंस्तस्मादृषयः" इति। अत्र ऋषिशब्दार्थं श्रुतिः स्वयमेव विवृणोति—यदित्यादिना। सर्वस्मादस्मात् परिदृश्यमानाज्जगतः पुरा सृष्टेः पूर्वकाले इदं जगदिच्छन् श्रमेण तपसा, बहु स्यामिति सङ्कल्परूपेणालोचनेन, आरिषन् अजानात्, तस्मात् ऋषय इति। छान्दसत्वात् व्यत्ययेन बहुवचनम्। 'तप आलोचने' इति 'ऋषी गतौ' इति च धातुपाठः। गत्यर्थानां ज्ञानार्थत्वादजानादित्यर्थ इति सायणः। 'ऋषिर्दर्शनात्' इति यास्कोऽप्या। अत्र यदित्यादिवाक्यशेषानालोचनेन प्राणशब्दस्येन्द्रियवाचकत्वभ्रमेण च तेषामनुत्पत्तिशङ्का। सिद्धान्ते तु अत्रत्यप्राणशब्दस्य परमात्मवाचकत्वेनेन्द्रियाणामनुत्पत्तिशङ्कानिरासः।

[1] च omitted A I. [2] मुख्यत्वासंभवात् M 1.

तत्पूर्वकत्वाद्वाचः ॥ ३ ॥

परमात्मनः सृष्टिपूर्वकत्वादितरेषां नामयोगस्य तदानीं प्राणशब्दो नेन्द्रियविषयः ॥

सप्तगत्यधिकरणम् २

सप्त गतेर्विशेषितत्वाच्च ॥ ४ ॥

सप्तैवेन्द्रियाणि, "सप्त प्राणाः" "यदा पञ्चावतिष्ठन्ते ज्ञानानि मनसा सह। बुद्धिश्च" इति सप्तानामेव सह गतेः, तेषामेव योगे विशेषितत्वाच्च ॥

3. *Tatpūrvakatvād vācaḥ*

On account of the speech having for its antecedent the creation.

The objects, other than the Highest Self, could be designated by names, only after the creation of the fire etc, by the Highest Self. Therefore at that time, the word, *Prāṇa* cannot refer to the sense-organs.

SAPTAGATYADHIKARANA 2

4. *Sapta gatervis'esitatvācca*

They are seven on account of the mentioning of movement and of specification.

The sense-organs are only seven in number. 'The seven *Prāṇās* come forth from Him' (*Mund.* II-1-8). 'When the five senses of knowledge stand still together with the mind and when the *Buddhi* does not move' (*Kath.* II-3-10). From the above mentioned scriptural texts it is understood that only the seven senses move with the individual selves and

हस्तादयस्तु स्थितेऽतो नैवम् ॥ ५ ॥

हस्तादयोऽपीन्द्रियाणि, जीवे देहान्तःस्थिते उपकारकत्वाविशेषात् । अतो न सप्तैव । अपि त्वेकादश; "दशेमे पुरुषे प्राणा आत्मैकादशः" "इन्द्रियाणि दशैकं च" इति श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्याम् । बुद्ध्यादयो मनोवृत्तिभेदाः । सप्तानां गतिश्रवणं विशेषणं च तेषां प्राधान्यात् ॥

प्राणाणुत्वाधिकरणम् ३

अणवश्च ॥ ६ ॥

there are specifications to show that these seven alone are mentioned in connection with the meditation.

5. *Hastādayastu sthiteto naivam*

But the hands, etc. are also the organs ; since they also assist the self when he abides in the body. Therefore it is not so.

Hands, etc. are also organs ; because they also assist the self, when he abides in the body. Therefore the organs are not seven only, but they are eleven. The scriptural statement is this—'Ten are these organs in person and *Ātman* is the eleventh' (*Bṛh.* III-9-4). 'The organs are ten and one' (*Bhag. Gī.* XIII-5). *Buddhi*, etc. are different functions of the *Manas* (mind). The scriptures mention the movement of the seven sense-organs and specify them. This is due to the fact, that they are prominent among the group.'

PRĀNĀNUTVĀDHIKARANA 3

6. *Aṇavaśca*

And they are atomic in size.

तानि चाणूनि, "प्राणमनूत्क्रामन्तं सर्वे प्राणा अनूत्क्रामन्ति" इति गतिश्रवणात् ॥

श्रेष्ठश्च ॥ ७ ॥

श्रेष्ठः पञ्चवृत्तिः प्राणोऽप्युत्पद्यते । उत्तरचिन्तार्थोऽयमनुवादः ॥

वायुक्रियाधिकरणम् ४

न वायुक्रिये पृथगुपदेशात् ॥ ८ ॥

पञ्चवृत्तिः प्राणो न वायुमात्रं, तत्क्रिया वा "एतस्माज्जायते प्राणः खं वायुः" इति पृथगुपदेशात् ॥

These organs are atomic in size. Their movement has been stated in the scriptural text, 'All these *Prāṇās* (senses) go out, following the *Prāṇa* (vital breath) when it goes out' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-2).

7. *Śreṣṭhaśca*

And the best.

By 'the best' we have to understand the *Prāṇa* (vital wind) with its fivefold function. This also is created. This is mentioned separately again here, so that this may be dealt with in the next *Sūtra* also.

VĀYUKRIYĀDHIKARAṆA 4

8. *Na vāyukriye pṛthagupadeśāt*

Prāṇa is neither the mere wind nor its function; on account of its being stated separately.

The *Prāṇa*, that has five functions, is neither mere wind nor its mere functions; because it is taught separately in the scriptural text 'From Him are produced *Prāṇa*, ether and wind' (*Muṇḍ.* II-1-3).

चक्षुरादिवत्तु तत्सहशिष्टयादिभ्यः ॥ ९ ॥

वायोः पृथग्भूतोऽयं नाग्न्यादिवद्भूतान्तरम् । वायुरेव [1]देहधारणयोग्याकारमापन्नश्चक्षुरादिवज्जीवोपकरणम्, चक्षुरादिभिः सहोपदेशतत्तुल्योपकारतन्मुख्यत्वेभ्यः ॥

अकरणत्वाच्च न दोषस्तथाहि दर्शयति ॥ १० ॥

करणं क्रिया । न जीवोपकाररूपक्रियारहितत्वेन[2] दोषः; यतः

9. *Cakṣurādıvattu tatsahas'ıṣṭyādıbhyaḥ*

But ıt ıs lıke the eye, etc., on account of being mentıoned along wıth them and for other reasons.

The *Prāṇa* ıs dıstınct from the mere wınd, but ıt ıs not an element completely dıfferent from ıt, lıke fire, etc. The wınd ıtself has taken the form, that ıs useful ın sustaınıng the body and ıs helpful for the functıons of the ındıvıdual selves, lıke the eye, etc., because ıt ıs mentıoned ın the scrıptural text along wıth the eye, etc. It ıs also equally helpıng the ındıvıdual selves, lıke the eye etc. and ıs ımportant among them.

10. *Akaraṇatvācca nadoṣastathāhi dars'ayatı*

And no objectıon arıses on account of the absense of its functıon; for the scrıptures declare its function.

The word, '*Karaṇa*' here means function; but no defect arıses on the presumptıon that ıt has no any action, which may be helpful to the ındıvıdual selves. Verily the scrıptural texts declare that ıt functıons so that the body

[1] देहधारणयोग्याकारताम् A 1, M 1. [2] त्वे Pr.

श्रुतिरेव देहेन्द्रियाद्यशैथिल्यकरणं दर्शयति, प्राणोत्क्रमणे देहेन्द्रियादि-शैथिल्याभिधानात् ॥

पञ्चवृत्तिर्मनोवद्व्यपदिश्यते ॥ ११ ॥

प्राण एक एव स्ववृत्तिभिः पञ्चभिः प्राणापानादिनामभाग्भवति; कामादिभिर्यथैकमेव मनः "कामः संकल्पः" इत्यारभ्य "एतत्सर्वं मन एव" इति ॥

श्रेष्ठाणुत्वाधिकरणम् ५

अणुश्च ॥ १२ ॥

"प्राणोऽनूत्क्रामति" इत्युत्क्रान्तेरणुः ॥

and the sense-organs may not be nullified; because, it is said that when the *Prāna* leaves the body, the body and the sense-organs become nullified or invalidated.

11. *Pañcavṛttirmanovadvyapadis'yate*

It is designated as possessing five-fold function like the *Manas* (mind).

The *Prāṇa* alone due to its five functions has different titles as *Prāna*, *Apāna*, etc. This is similar to the division of *Manas* (mind), that is only one, into a number of varieties, such as desire, etc. This is stated in the scriptural text beginning with 'Desire, will,' and ending with 'All this is truly mind' (*Bṛh.* I-5-3).

S'RESTHĀNUTVĀDHIKARAṆA 5

12. *Aṇus'ca*

And it is atomic in size.

The *Prāna* is atomic in size because of its going out. This is stated in the text, 'The *Prāṇa* goes out behind him' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-2).

ज्योतिराद्यधिष्ठानाधिकरणम् ६

ज्योतिराद्यधिष्ठानं तु तदामननात्प्राणवता, शब्दात् ॥ १३ ॥

जीवेन सहाग्न्यादेरिन्द्रियाद्यधिष्ठानं परमात्मसंकल्पादेव भवति, "योऽग्नौ तिष्ठन्नग्निमन्तरो यमयति" इत्यादिशब्दात् ॥

तस्य च नित्यत्वात् ॥ १४ ॥

[1]सर्वस्य तन्नियाम्यत्वनियमात्[2] ॥

JYOTIRĀDYADHISTHĀNĀDHIKARANA 6

13. *Jyotirādyadhiṣṭhānaṁ tu tadāmananāt prāṇavatā, s'abdāt*

But the ruling over the senses on the part of the fire etc, along with the self, is owing to the will of that Highest Self; on account of the scriptural statement.

The fire, etc. along with the individual self, have their control over the sense-organs, due to the will of the Highest Self. This is stated in the scriptural text, 'Dwelling in the fire, He controls the fire from within' (*Bṛh.* III-7-5).

14. *Tasya ca nityatvāt*

And because of this being invariable.

It is because of the fact that everything is invariably under His control.

[1] सर्वस्य च A 1. [2] वचनात् M 1.

इन्द्रियाधिकरणम् ७

त इन्द्रियाणि तद्व्यपदेशादन्यत्र श्रेष्ठात् ॥ १५ ॥

श्रेष्ठादन्यत्र ये प्राणास्त इन्द्रियाणि, तेष्वेवेन्द्रियव्यपदेशात् "इन्द्रियाणि दशैकं च" इत्यादौ ॥

भेदश्रुतेर्वैलक्षण्याच्च ॥ १६ ॥

"एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च" इति भेदेनोत्पत्तिश्रुतेः; इन्द्रियवृत्त्युपरमेऽपि प्राणवृत्त्यनुपरमवैलक्षण्याच्च ॥

INDRIYĀDHIKARANA 7

15. *Ta indriyāṇi tadvyapades'ādanyatra s'reṣṭhāt*

With the exception of the best, they are the sense-organs; because they are so designated.

The *Prāṇās*, other than the best (*Mukhyaprāṇa*) are the sense-organs; because they are so designated. The authority here is this 'The sense-organs are ten and one' (*Bhag. Gī.* XIII-5).

16. *Bhedas'rutervailakṣaṇyācca*

On account of the scriptural statement of difference and on account of distinction in characteristics.

The scriptural text, that states that the *Prāna* is created as different from the sense-organs is this—'From Him is originated *Prāna*, mind and all the sense-organs' (*Mund.* II-1-3). It is also thus because the functions of the *Prāna* do not stop, even when the sense-organs cease to function. Hence the sense-organs and the *Prāṇa* possess distinct characteristics.

संज्ञामूर्तिक्लृप्त्यधिकरणम् ८

संज्ञामूर्तिक्लृप्तिस्तु त्रिवृत्कुर्वत उपदेशात् ॥ १७ ॥

देवादिनामरूपव्यष्टिसृष्टिश्चतुर्मुखशरीरकात् परमात्मन एव, न केवलचतुर्मुखात्; "नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि। तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकां करवाणि" इति त्रिवृत्करणं कुर्वतो नामरूपव्याकरणोपदेशात् । त्रिवृत्करणं तु केवलचतुर्मुखस्य न संभवति, त्रिवृत्कृतैस्तेजोऽबन्नैरण्डमुत्पाद्य पश्चाच्चतुर्मुखसृष्टेः;

"तदण्डमभवद्धैमं सहस्रांशुसमप्रभम् ।
तस्मिन् जज्ञे स्वयं ब्रह्मा सर्वलोकपितामहः ॥"

इत्यादिस्मृतेः ॥

SAMJÑĀMŪRTIKLPTYADHIKARANA 8

17. *Samjñāmūrtiklptistu trivṛtkurvata upadeśāt*

But the assignment of the names and forms belongs to Him, who does *Trivṛtkaraṇa* (combining the three elements); on account of the scriptural teaching.

The assignment of the names and forms such as gods etc. belongs to the Highest Self alone, who has for His body the four-faced god (the creator); and not to the four-faced god himself. This is so because the scriptural text teaches that the assignment of the names and forms was made by the same who did the *Trivrtkarana* (combining the three elements). The scriptural text is this—'Let me differentiate names and forms and let me make each of them as combination of the three elements' (*Chānd.* VI-3-2) But the four-faced god cannot do himself the *Trivrtkarana.* First is created the egg-shaped universe out of fire, water, and food combined together. Subsequently the four-faced god is created. The *Smṛti* text is this—'That egg-shaped universe of golden colour

मांसादि भौमं यथाशब्दमितरयोश्च ॥ १८ ॥

"अन्नमशितं त्रेधा विधीयते" इत्यत्र प्रागुक्तत्रिवृत्करणादर्थान्तरभूतोऽण्डान्तर्वर्तिपुरुषभुक्तान्नादीनां परिणामप्रकार[1] उच्यते। अन्यथा मांसमनसोः पुरीषादणीयस्त्वेनाप्यत्वतैजसत्वप्रसक्तिः[2]। तथा सति "अन्नमशितं त्रेधा" इति भूमेरेव त्रेधात्वोपक्रमः, "अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मनः"

shining like the sun, was created. In that egg was born himself the four-faced *Brahman* the grandfather of the entire universe' (*Manu.* I-9).

18. *Māṁsādi bhaumaṁ yathāśabdamitarayośca*

Flesh etc. are of earthy nature; in the case of the other two, it has to be considered according to the text.

Consider the scriptural text, 'The food eaten is divided into three parts' (*Chānd* VI-5-1). Here is stated the mode of modification of the food etc. taken by men living in the egg-shaped universe, the modification being different from the *Trivṛtkaraṇa*. Otherwise the flesh and the mind (*Manas*) which are smaller in size than the excavated matters, must have the character of fire and water. If it were so, it contradicts the statements, 'Food taken is formed into three' (*Chānd.* VI-5-1); because the earth alone is said to become into the three (*i.e.* the food, water, and fire). It also contradicts the statement, 'Oh beloved,! The mind is *Annamaya* (the modification,

[1] प्रकारः omitted M 3. [2] प्रसङ्गात् M 3.

इति मनसो भौमत्वं च विरुध्यते। तथेतरयोरप्तेजसोस्त्रैविध्यं विरुध्यते। तदिदमाह—मांसादि भौमं यथाशब्दमितरयोश्चेति। पुरीषवन्मांसमनसी अपि भौमे इतीहोच्यते। तथा मूत्रवल्लोहितप्राणावप्याप्यौ। तथा अस्थिवन्मज्जावाचौ तैजस्यौ॥

पूर्वमेव त्रिवृत्कृतं चेत्, त्र्यात्मकं वस्तु कथमन्नमापस्तेज इत्युच्यते? इत्यत्राह—

वैशेष्यात्तु तद्वादस्तद्वादः॥ १९॥

of food)' (*Chānd.* VI-5-4), because the mind has the character of earth. In the same way there will be the contradiction in respect of the three-fold modification of the other two, *namely*, fire and water. Therefore it is stated thus—'The flesh, etc. are of earthy nature. In the case of the other two, it has to be considered according to the text.' Indeed it is stated here that the flesh and mind, have an earthy nature, like the excavated matters. In the same way the blood, and the *Prāna* are of watery nature, as in the case of the urine. In the same way the marrow and speech are of fiery nature, as in the case of the bones.

There is the combination of the three made already. How then can it be said that the object, that is the combination of the three is mentioned as earth, water and fire? Here the reply is this:—

19. *Vais'eṣyāt tu tadvādastadvādaḥ*

But on account of their greater parts, there is that designation, that designation.

अन्नादिभूयस्त्वेन वैशेष्यादन्नादिवादः ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे द्वितीयस्याध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः

समाप्तश्चाध्यायः

They are called food etc. because there are greater parts of food etc. in them.

THUS ENDS THE 4TH PĀDA OF THE 2ND ADHYĀYA

तृतीयाध्याये प्रथमः पादः

तदन्तरप्रतिपत्त्यधिकरणम् १

तदन्तरप्रतिपत्तौ रंहति संपरिष्वक्तः प्रश्न-निरूपणाभ्याम् ॥ १ ॥

जीवो [1]देहाद्देहान्तरप्राप्तौ[2] भूतसूक्ष्मैः संपरिष्वक्तो यातीति पञ्चाग्निविद्यायां प्रश्नप्रतिवचनाभ्यामवगम्यते । "वेत्थ यथा पञ्चम्यामाहुतावापः पुरुषवचसो भवन्ति" इति प्रश्नः, "इति तु पञ्चम्यामाहुतावापः पुरुष-

ADHYĀYA III, PĀDA I

TADANTARAPRATIPATTYADHIKARAṆA 1

1. *Tadantarapratipattau raṁhati saṁpariṣvaktaḥ, praśnanirūpaṇābhyām*

In obtaining another of that, he goes embraced as understood from question and explantion.

The self, when going from one body to another, goes embraced by the subtle rudiments of the elements. This is known from the question and answer recorded in the *Pañcāgnividyā* (*Chānd.* V-3-3). The question is this:—'Do you know why in the fifth oblation water becomes to be called 'person'? The reply is this:—'Thus indeed in the fifth

[1] देहात् omitted M 1. [2] प्रतिपत्तौ A 1, M 1.

वचसो भवन्ति" इति प्रतिवचनम्। [1]तयोरुत्तरैः सूत्रैरर्थोऽभिव्यज्यते। स चायमर्थः—जीवो ब्राह्मणादिदेहस्थो [2]यागदानादिकर्मकृत्[3] [4]तत्तत्फलभोगायास्माद्देहादुत्थाय[5] गच्छन्, एतद्देहस्थाभिर्भूतान्तरसंसृष्टाभिः सूक्ष्माकाराभिरद्भिः [6]संपरिष्वक्तोऽग्नित्वेन [7]रूपितं द्युलोकं [8]प्राप्य, ताभिरेवामृतमयदेहाकारपरिणताभिरद्भिः परिष्वक्तो देवानां [9]शेषत्वमुपगम्य, तैः सह तत्रत्यभोगमनुभूय, कर्मावसाने भुक्तशिष्टब्राह्मणादियोनिप्रापककर्मणा

oblation water becomes to be called 'person' (*Chānd.* V-9-1). The purport of the question and answer is indicated in the subsequent *Sūtras.* The purport is this—'The individual selves enveloped with the bodies of *Brāhmann* etc. perform the sacrifice, gifts etc. Then in order to enjoy the fruits of these actions in other world, he starts from this body for other world. Then being embraced with water of the subtle state mixed with the redimentary other elements he reaches the heaven (*dyuloka*), that has been mentioned figuratively as fire. There he becomes embraced with the water that becomes modified into the body of the nature of *Amṛta* (deathlessness) and becomes subservient to the gods. There he enjoys the fruits of his actions along with the gods. When his *Karmans* are practically exhausted he becomes born again in the world of *Karman,* as *Brāhmaṇa,* etc. along with a portion of his unspent *Karmans* which effects

[1] तयोः omitted M 2, Pr.
[2] स्वाहा M 2, Pr.
[3] कृत्वा M 1.
[4] तत्फल, A 1, M 1.
[5] स्वाद्देहादुत्थाय M 1.
[6] सं omitted A 1, M 2.
[7] निरूपित M 3, निरूपितं Pr.
[8] प्राप्ताभिः A1.
[9] शेषभावं A 1, M 1.

सह पुनरपीमं [1]कर्मलोकमागत्य,[2] कर्म कर्तुं ताभिः परिष्वक्तोऽग्नित्वरूपितं पर्जन्यं प्राप्य, वर्षधाराभिः सहाग्नित्वरूपितां[3] पृथिवीमुपगम्य, व्रीह्यादिसस्येन संयुज्य, अन्नाकारपरिणतेन[4] तेन सहाग्नित्वरूपितं[5] पुरुषं प्राप्य, तत्र शुक्लाकारपरिणताभिस्ताभिरद्भिः[6] परिष्वक्तोऽग्नित्वरूपितां[7] योषितं प्राप्य, तत्र गर्भाकारपरिणताभिस्ताभिरद्भिः[8] पुरुषशब्दाभिलपनीयाभिः परिष्वक्तः कर्मानुरूपं ब्राह्मणादिरूपेण जायत इति ॥

त्र्यात्मकत्वात्तु भूयस्त्वात् ॥ २ ॥

the birth as *Brāhmana* etc. In order to perform *Karmans* again, being embraced with the water he enters the *Parjanya* (clouds) imagined as fire. In the form of rain he enters the earth imagined as fire. Then he becomes united with *Vrīhi* (paddy) etc. which is subsequently transformed as food. Then along with the food, he enters the person who is imagined as fire. There he along with that water which is transformed as *S'ukla* (semen virile) enter the woman imagined as fire. There being embraced with that transformed water that subsequently take the formation of the Garbha or womb and will be later known as person (man or woman) is born as *Brāhmaṇa* etc. according to his *Karman.*

2. *Tryātmakatvāt tu bhūyastvāt*

But on account (of water) consisting of the three elements: because there is the predominance (of watery part in it).

[1] कर्म omitted M 1, 2.
[2] आगम्य, M 1, Pr.
[3] निरूपितां A 1. निरूपितपृथिवी Pr.
[4] परिणताभिः सह M 1.
[5] निरूपितं M 2, Pr.
[6] ताभिः omitted A 1.
[7] निरूपितां A. 1 Pr.
[8] ताभिरद्भिः omitted M 2, 3.

सर्वस्य त्रिवृत्करणेन त्र्यात्मकत्वाद्भूतान्तरसंसृष्टा एवापो भूयस्त्वेनाप्शब्देनोच्यन्ते ॥

प्राणगतेश्च ॥ ३ ॥

"प्राणमनूत्क्रामन्तं सर्वे प्राणा अनूत्क्रामन्ति" इति जीवेन सहेन्द्रियगतेस्तदाश्रयत्वेन देहगमनं प्रतीयते[1] ॥

अग्न्यादिगतिश्रुतेरिति चेन्न, भाक्तत्वात् ॥ ४ ॥

All objects consist of the three elements due to *Trivṛt-karaṇa.* But the water, through mixed with other elements is called water, because there is a predominence of watery part in it.

3. *Prāṇagateśca*

And on account of the going out of the *Prāṇas* (with the individual selves).

'When the *Prāna* (the self) departs from (the body) all the *Prānas* pass away following him' (*Brh.* IV-4-2) The sense-organs pass out the body along with the individual self. It is, therefore, apprehended that the sense organs depart from the body along with the subtle form of the body which is the seat of them.

4. *Agnyādigatiśrutemiti cenna, bhāktatvāt*

If it be said that it is not so on account of scriptural statement as to their going to *Agni* (fire) etc; we say no; on account of the secondary nature of the statement.

[1] M 2, adds after 'स्मर्यते च मनःषष्ठानीन्द्रियाणीत्यादिना ।'

"अग्निं वागप्येति" इतीन्द्रियाणामग्न्यादिगतिश्रुतेर्न जीवेन सह[1] गमनमिति चेत्; न, वागाद्यभिमानिदेवतासु भाक्तत्वाद्वागादिशब्दानाम्; "ओषधीर्लोमानि" इत्यनपियद्भिर्लोमादिभिः सह पाठात् ॥

प्रथमेऽश्रवणादिति चेन्न, ता एव ह्युपपत्तेः ॥ ५ ॥

प्रथमे [2]द्युलोकाग्निहोमेऽपामश्रवणान्नापो गच्छन्ति; "एतस्मिन्नग्नौ देवाः श्रद्धां जुह्वति" इति श्रद्धैव [3]श्रुतेति चेत्; न; आप एव श्रद्धा-

As the texts, ' when the speech of the dead goes into fire' (*Bṛh.* III. 2-13) etc. declare that when a person dies, his organs go into fire, etc. Hence they do not accompany the individual selves. This question is not correct. Here the words, speech etc., have the secondary meaning, *namely* ' the divinities (*Agni* etc.) who preside over them , because the text continues to say ' The hairs of the body enter into the herbs '. (*Bṛh.* III. 2-13). The hairs do not enter with the visible form into the herbs.

5. *Prathameśravaṇāditi cenna, tā eva hyupapatteḥ*

Should it be said, on account of the absence of mention of the water in the first instance the waters do not go ; we say no ; for just that is meant, on the ground of appropriateness.

The waters do not go with the individual selves, because the scriptural texts do not mention waters in the first instance (in the fire of heavens). In the scriptural text, ' Into that fire, the Devas (senses) offer *S'raddhā* as oblation ' (*Chānd.* V. 4-2) we understand that only the word, *S'raddhā* is used. It is not

[1] सह omitted A 1, Pr. [2] द्युलोके, M 1. Pr , द्युलोकाग्नौ M 1.
[3] श्रूयत इति M 1.

शब्देनोच्यन्त इत्यप्सु पृष्टासु तदुत्तरत्वोपपत्तेर्गम्यते । "श्रद्धा वा आपः" इति हि[1] श्रूयते ॥

अश्रुतत्वादिति चेन्न, इष्टादिकारिणां प्रतीतेः ॥ ६ ॥

अत्र प्रश्नप्रतिवचनयोराप एव प्रतीयन्ते ; न तत्परिष्वक्तो जीव इति चेत् ; न, उत्तरत्र "अथ य इमे ग्राम इष्टापूर्ते दत्तमित्युपासते" इत्यादाविष्टादिकारिणां गमनप्रकारवचनात् । द्युलोकाग्निसंबन्ध्यप्शब्दवाच्यस्य

so. Only water is meant by the word, *S'raddhā*, because to the question relating to the water, the reply must be on the water itsef. This reply is sensible only if the water is meant by the word *S'raddhā*. There is scriptural text also '*S'raddhā*, indeed, is water' (*Tait. Brāh.* III. 2-4-1).

6. *As'rutatvāditi cenna, iṣṭādikāriṇām pratīteḥ*

If it be said that the self is not stated in the scripture; way say 'it is not so'; because those, who perform sacrifice etc, have been understood there.

If it is said that water alone is understood by the question and answer in this context and not the individual selves, that are embraced by the subtle rudimentary elements; we say it is not so; because in a subsequent passage of the text is mentioned the route taken by those selves who perform the sacrifices etc. The text is this—'But those who in the village perform sacrifices, dig wells, etc. and grant gifts' (*Chānd.* V. 10-3). There is another scriptural text 'By that oblation he becomes King *Soma*' (*Chānd.* V. 4-2). Here that, who is denoted by the word 'water' connected with the fire of *Dyuloka* (the heavens),

[1] हि omitted M 1, Pr.

"तस्या आहुतेः सोमो राजा संभवति" इति सोमभूतस्यैव "सोमो राजा" इति प्रत्यभिज्ञानादद्भिः परिष्वक्तस्तच्छरीरक एवाप इत्युच्यत इत्यवगम्यते ॥

भाक्तं वानात्मवित्त्वात्; तथाहि दर्शयति ॥ ७ ॥

"एष सोमो राजा; तं देवा भक्षयन्ति" इति सोमापन्नस्य देवैर्भक्ष्यमाणत्ववचनं भाक्तम्; अनात्मवित्त्वेन देवोपकरणत्वाभिप्रायम्। तथाहि श्रुतिः—"यथा पशुरेवं स देवानाम्". इति पशुवद्देवोपकरणत्वं

is mentioned as becoming the King *Soma*. The same that has assumed the state of King *Soma* is recognised in the scriptural text 'King *Soma*' (*Chānd.* V. 10-4). Therefore by the word, water, is meant the individual self, who is embraced with the water and has it for his body. This is what is understood in the scriptural texts.

7. *Bhāktaṁ vānātmavittvāt*; *tathā hi darśayati*

Or this reference is metaphorical; because of their not knowing the Self. Indeed thus the scripture declares.

'He becomes *Soma* King; Him the gods eat' (*Chānd.* V. 10-4). Here the eating by the gods of the self who has become as King *Soma*, must be taken metaphorically. The idea is that he becomes the means of enjoyment of the gods; because he is other than the realizer of the Self. Accordingly it has been stated in the text 'He is like an animal for the gods,' (*Bṛh.* 1-4-10). This statement reveals that he is the means of enjoyment of the gods. The following

दर्शयति । तथात्मविदामनात्मविदां च परमपुरुषोपकरणत्वं देवोपकरणत्वं च स्मर्यंते "देवान् देवयजो यान्ति मद्भक्ता यान्ति मामपि" इति ॥

कृतात्ययाधिकरणम् २

कृतात्ययेऽनुशयवान् दृष्टस्मृतिभ्यां यथेतमनेवं च ॥ ८ ॥

कृतस्य कर्मणोऽन्ते निवर्तमानो भुक्तशिष्टकर्मैवान्निवर्तत इति श्रुति-स्मृतिभ्यामवगम्यते । "रमणीयचरणा रमणीया योनिमापद्यन्ते" इति श्रुतिः ।

Smṛti text also says that the realizers of the Self and the non-realizers of the Self are means of enjoyment of the Highest Person and of the gods respectively—'Those, who worship the gods go unto the gods and those, who worship Me, go unto Me' (*Bha. Gī.* VII. 23-7).

KṚTĀTYAYĀDHIKARAṆA 2

8. *Kṛtātyayenuśayavān dṛṣṭasmṛtibhyāṁ yathetamanevaṁ ca*

On the exhaustion of the *Karmans*, the selves descend with a remainder of *Karman*, according to the *Vedic* texts and *Smṛtis*. The descent is by the same route of the ascent and also not so.

It is understood by the scriptures and the *Smṛtis* that on the exhaustion of *Karmans*, the self returns to this world with a remainder of the *Karman* whose fruits he has not enjoyed. The scriptural text is this—'Those, whose deeds are good, are born in good families' (*Chānd.* V. 10-7). The *Smṛti* texts

"ततः परिवृत्तौ कर्मफलशेषेण जातिं रूपम्" इत्यादिका स्मृतिः। [1]आरोहणप्रकारेण मार्गैकदेशे,[2] प्रकारान्तरेण चैकदेशे[3] ॥

चरणादिति चेन्न, तदुपलक्षणार्थेति कार्ष्णाजिनिः ॥ ९ ॥

"रमणीयचरणाः" इति चरणशब्दान्न सानुशयः,[4] चरणशब्दस्य स्मार्ताचारविषयत्वादिति चेत्; न; अनुशयोपलक्षणार्था [5]चरणश्रुतिः, तस्यैव [6]सुखदुःखसाधनत्वात् ॥

are these—'Afterwards when a man returns to this world, he obtains, by virtue of a remainder of *Karman*, birth, form' (Āpa. Dha. *Sūtra* II. 1, 2, 3) and so on. The descent takes place partly through the route of ascent and partly by a different route.

9. *Caraṇāditi cenna, tadupalakṣaṇārtheti Kārṣṇājiniḥ*

Should it be said that it is not so on account of the term *Caraṇa*; not so, since *Caraṇa* connotes the *Karman* also: thus *Kārṣṇājini* thinks.

The word, *Carana*, occurring in the passage 'Those, whose deeds are good' does not mean the remainder of *Karman*, because it is generally used in the sense of *Smārtācāra* (*i.e.*, general conduct, described in the *Smṛtis*). Therefore the self is not followed by the remainder of his *Karman*. This is not so. In the scriptural text the term *Caraṇa* connotes the remainder of *Karman* also, because the pleasure and grief are the result of such *Karman* only.

[1] आरोहप्रकारेण Pr.
[2] देश: A 1, Pr.
[3] देश: A 1. Pr.
[4] अनुशयः Pr.
[5] आचार M I. Pr.
[6] सुखसाधनत्वात् A 1, M I, Pr.

आनर्थक्यमिति चेन्न, तदपेक्षत्वात् ॥ १० ॥

स्मार्ताचारस्यानुपयोगादानर्थक्यमिति चेत्; न, तदपेक्षत्वात् सर्वस्य पुण्यकर्मणः; "संध्याहीनोऽशुचिर्नित्यमनर्हः सर्वकर्मसु" इति वचनादिति कार्ष्णाजिनिमतम् ॥

सुकृतदुष्कृते एवेति तु बादरिः ॥ ११ ॥

'रमणीयचरणाः, कपूयचरणाः' इति चरणशब्देन सुकृतदुष्कृते एवाभिधीयेते,[1] 'पुण्यं कर्माचरति' इति प्रसिद्धेरिति [2]बादरिः ।

10. *Ānarthakyamiti cenna, tadapekṣatvāt*

Should it be said that there is no purpose; it is not so, on account of the dependence of *Karman* on the conduct.

No purpose is served as there is no use of the conduct mentioned in the *Smṛtis*. It is not so; because all the good works are dependent on the conduct. Because it is stated thus—'He, who does not worship *Sandhyā*, is always impure, and he is unfit for any religious work'. This is the view of *Kārsnājini*.

11. *Sukṛtaduṣkṛte eveti tu Bādariḥ*

But *Bādari* thinks that the word *Caraṇa* means good and evil works only.

The word, *Caraṇa*, occurring in the text 'Ramanīya-*caranāḥ* and 'Kapūya-*caraṇāḥ*' means good and evil actions as evident from the usage 'he does the works of good nature.' This has been opined by *Bādari*. Sūtrakāra accepts this view

[1] अभिधेये M 1. [2] भगवान् बादरिः M 1.

एतदेव स्वीकृतम् । स्मार्ताचारापेक्षं सर्वं पुण्यं कर्मेति च स्वीकृतम् ॥

अनिष्टादिकार्यधिकरणम् ३

अनिष्टादिकारिणामपि च श्रुतम् ॥ १२ ॥

इष्टापूर्ताद्यकुर्वतामपि चन्द्रगमनमस्ति । "ये वै के चास्माल्लोकात्प्रयन्ति चन्द्रमसमेव ते सर्वे गच्छन्ति[1]" इत्यविशेषात् ॥

संयमने त्वनुभूयेतरेषामारोहावरोहौ, तद्गतिदर्शनात् ॥ १३ ॥

only. He also accepts that all the works of meritorious nature are based on the conduct, prescribed in the *Smṛtis*.

ANISTĀDIKĀRYADHIKARANA 3

12. *Aniṣṭādikāriṇāmapi ca s'rutam*

Even for those who do not perform the sacrifice; etc. the ascent is declared by scriptures.

Even they, who do not perform the sacrifices and do not dig wells etc. reach the moon. This is stated in the scriptural text, 'All, who depart from this world, go to the moon' (*Kaus.* I-9).

13. *Saṁyamane tvanubhūyetareṣāmārohāvarohau, tad-gatidars'anāt*

But as regards others, after experiencing the results in the world of *Saṁyamana* (the god of death), there is ascent and descent; as such a course has been declared in the scriptures.

[1] सर्वे गच्छन्ति omitted M 1, Pr.

इष्टापूर्ताद्यकुर्वतां यमसदने तत्फलमनुभूयारोहादि,[1] "वैवस्वतं संगमनम्" इत्यादौ तद्गतिदर्शनात् ॥

स्मरन्ति च ॥ १४ ॥

"सर्वे चैते वशं यान्ति यमस्य" इत्यादि[2] ॥

अपि सप्त ॥ १५ ॥

सप्त रौरवादीनपि स्मरन्ति ॥

तत्रापि तद्व्यापारादविरोधः ॥ १६ ॥

तत्रापि यमव्यापारादेव यमवश्यताया अविरोधः ॥

But they, who do not perform the sacrifice, etc., experience the results of their *Karmans* in the kingdom of *Yama.* Then there are for them the ascent and descent, because it has been so stated in the text, 'The son of *Vivasavat*, (*i.e.*, *Yama*) is to be reached' (*Tait. Ār.* VI-1-1).

14 *Smaranti ca*

And they declare accordingly.

There are *Smṛti* texts also—'All these are in the sway of *Yama*' and so on.

15. *Api sapta*

And seven.

The *Smṛtis* say that there are seven hells *Raurava* and others.

16. *Tatrāpi tadvyāpārādavirodhaḥ*

On account of there being of his activity, there is no contradiction.

There is no contradiction to the sway of *Yama*; because there also are *Yama's* activities.

[1] आरोहादि,, A 1, M Pr.　　[2] इति M I. Pr.

विद्याकर्मणोरिति तु प्रकृतत्वात् ॥ १७ ॥

विद्याकर्मणोः फलं ब्रह्मगमनं चन्द्रगमनं च । कथम्? "तद्य इत्थं विदुस्तेऽर्चिषमभिसंभवन्ति" "य[1] इष्टापूर्ते दत्तमित्युपासते ते धूममभिसंभवन्ति" इति प्रकृतत्वात् ब्रह्मचन्द्रगमनयोः । अतः पापिनां न तद्गतिप्रसङ्गः ॥

न तृतीये, तथोपलब्धेः ॥ १८ ॥

न च पापिनां द्युलोकगमनाय[2] चन्द्रलोकगमनापेक्षा[3], तेषां

17. *Vidyākarmaṇoriti tu prakṛtatvāt*

But of the knowledge and the *Karman;* on account of those being in the context.

The fruits derived from knowledge and *Karman* are the attainments of the *Brahman* and the moon respectively. How is this? This is because of the following scriptural texts—'Those who know thus, reach the light' (*Chānd.* V-10-1). 'Those, who perform the sacrifices, dig wells etc. and give the gifts, reach the smoke' (*Chānd.* V-10-3). Hence, those, who do *Pāpakarmans* (evil actions) do not traverse that route after death.

18. *Na tṛtīye, tathopalabdheḥ*

Not this in the case of the third; because it is so apprehended.

Those, who do *Pāpakarmans* (evil actions) need not go to

[1] ये omitted M 1, Pr. [2] देहारम्भाय द्युलोकगमनापेक्षा M 1.
[3] चन्द्रलोकगमनापेक्षा omitted M 1.

द्युलोकगमनाभावोपलब्धेः "अथैतयोः पथोर्न कतरेणचन[1]" इत्यारभ्य "एतत्तृतीयं स्थानं तेनासौ लोको न संपूर्यते" इति । तृतीयस्थानमिति[2] पापकर्माण[3] उच्यन्ते ॥

स्मर्यतेऽपि च लोके ॥ १९ ॥

लोके च द्रौपद्यादीनां पुण्यकर्मणामपि[4] पञ्चमाहुत्यनपेक्षदेहारम्भः[5] स्मर्यते ॥

दर्शनाच्च ॥ २० ॥

the world of the moon, in order to reach *Dyuloka* (the heavens); because it is apprehended that they do not go to the *Dyuloka* at all. The text begins with, 'Then of these two paths, they do not go by either' and ends with, 'This is the third place. That world is not filled by this' (*Chānd*. V-10-8). By the words 'the third place, are stated the *Pāpakarmans* (those who commit evil deeds).

19. *Smaryatepi ca loke*

It, moreover, is recorded in the world.

Smṛti texts state that the bodies of some meritorious persons, such as *Draupadī*, etc. were formed independently without the help of the fifth oblation.

20. *Dersanācca*

And on account of its being seen.

[1] कतरेणच Pr कश्चन, केचनेत्यादिवत् कतरेणचनेति निर्देशो ज्ञातव्यः.

[2] स्थानं हि M 1.

[3] पापकर्मिणः M 2.

[4] अपि omitted M 3,

[5] पञ्चमाहुत्यनपेक्षा देहारम्भे M 1,

[1]तथा श्रुतावपि दृश्यते "भूतानां त्रीण्येव बीजानि भवन्त्याण्डजं जीवजमुद्भिज्जम्" इति स्वेदजोद्भिज्जयोस्तदनपेक्षत्वम् ॥

तृतीयशब्दावरोधः संशोकजस्य ॥ २१ ॥

स्वेदजस्योद्भिज्जशब्देन संग्रह इत्यर्थः ॥

तत्स्वाभाव्यापत्त्यधिकरणम् ४

तत्स्वाभाव्यापत्तिरुपपत्तेः ॥ २२ ॥

Thus it has been stated in the scriptures also 'Of all beings there are only three origins, that which springs from an egg, that which springs from a living being, and that which springs from a sprout' (*Chānd.* VI-3-1). Of the sethose, that are born from sweat and those that are born from the sprout, do originate themselves without the help of the fifth oblation.

21. *Tṛtīyaśabdāvarodhaḥ saṁśokajasya*

The third term includes that which springs from sweat.

The meaning is this—'That which springs from sweat, is to be included in those denoted by the term Udbhijja (born from the sprout).

TATSVĀBHĀVYĀPATTYADHIKARAṆA 4

22. *Tatsvābhāvyāpattirupapatteḥ*

There is entering into similarity with those things, there being a reason.

[1] तथाच M. 3,

"यथेतमाकाशम्" [1]इत्यादिनाकाशादिसादृश्यापत्तिः प्रत्यवरोहत[2] उपदिश्यते, तत्र तत्र सुखदुःखानुभवाभावोपपत्तेः[3]। तदनुभवार्थं हि तत्तच्छरीरता ॥

नातिचिराधिकरणम् ५

नातिचिरेण विशेषात् ॥ २३ ॥

व्रीह्यादिप्राप्तेः प्रागाकाशादिषु नातिचिरं तिष्ठति। "[4]अतो वै खलु दुर्निष्प्रपतरम्" इति व्रीह्यादावेव विशेषवचनात् ॥

It is taught in the following scriptural text, that on the return journey the individual selves become similar to the ether etc.—'As they went, they return into the ether, etc.' (*Chāṇd.* V-10-5) because in those places there will not be the experience of pleasure and pain. Indeed, the individual selves take various forms in order to experience pleasure and pain.

NĀTICIRĀDHIKARAṆA 5

23. *Nāticireṇa viśeṣāt*

(Duration of stay in ether, etc.) will not be long, on account of the special statement.

The individual selves do not remain long in ether etc., before they enter *Vrīhi* etc. because there is special statement only as regards the *Vrīhi* etc. The statement is this—'Therefore, verily indeed, it is very difficult to emerge' (*Chāṇd.* V-10-6).

[1] आदि omitted Pr.
[2] प्रत्यवरोहे M 1.
[3] सुखदुःखानुभवाभावरूपोपपत्तेः A 1.
[4] अतो ह वै M 1.

अन्याधिष्ठिताधिकरणम् ६

अन्याधिष्ठिते पूर्ववदभिलापात् ॥ २४ ॥

"त इह व्रीहियवाः" इत्यादौ चान्यजीवाधिष्ठिते व्रीहियवादौ संश्लेषमात्रम्, अवरोहत आकाशादिष्विव [1]जननहेतुविरहिताभिलापात्। "जायन्ते" इति वचनमौपचारिकम्। यत्र ब्राह्मणादिजन्मास्ति, तत्र "रमणीयचरणाः" इति हि[2] हेतुरभिलप्यते ॥

अशुद्धमिति चेन्न, शब्दात् ॥ २५ ॥

ANYĀDHIṢṬHITĀDHIKARANA 6

24. *Anyādhiṣṭhite pūrvavadabhilāpāt*

He is connected with rice, grain etc. that are animated by other selves, because of the statement as in the previous cases.

As the rice etc., are already animated by other selves, the descending selves, only cling to them as stated in the text, 'They are born as rice, grain etc. (*Chānd.* V-10-6). It is because there is no mention of the cause of the birth as rice etc. just as in the case of the birth as the ether etc. The word, 'born' used therein must be taken in a metaphorical sense. Suppose they are born as *Brāhmaṇas* etc., then there is mentioned the cause of the birth in the text 'those of good deeds', etc., (*Chānd.* V-10-7).

25. *As'uddhamiti cenna, s'abdāt*

If it be said, it is impure; not so, on account of the scriptural statements.

[1] जन्महेतु M 2, जनिहेतु A 1. [2] हि omitted M 3.

अवरोहतः पूर्वानुष्ठितयागादिष्वग्नीषोमीयादिहिंसागर्भत्वेनाशुद्धं कर्मास्तीति चेत्; न, "हिरण्यशरीर ऊर्ध्वः स्वर्गं लोकमेति" "न वा उ वेतन्म्रियसे न रिष्यसि" इति पशुसंज्ञपनस्याहिंसात्वशब्दात् ॥

रेतःसिग्योगोऽथ ॥ २६ ॥

"यो यो ह्यन्नमत्ति यो रेतः सिञ्चति" इत्यन्नेन संसृष्टस्य रेतःसिचा योगमात्रमनन्तरमुच्यते । अतः पूर्वमपि व्रीह्यादियोगमात्रम् ॥

While descending, the individual selves descend with their impure actions, because when they performed sacrifices in former generations, they committed injury to living beings, that were offered in *Agnīṣoma* and other sacrifices. It is not so. Slaughtering the animals in sacrifices is not of an injurious kind. This is stated in the text, 'with a golden body, it goes up to the heavenly world,' 'By this action you do not die, nor you become subject to injury' (*Tait. Brā.* III-7-7).

26. *Retaḥsigyogotha*

After that, there is conjunction with him, who performs the act of generation.

'Whoever eats the food and emits the semen, that being he becomes' (*Chānd.* V-10-6). Thus it is stated that after the conjunction with food, the self becomes conjunct with him who performs the act of generation. Therefore he becomes only connected with rice etc., even before that stage.

योनेः शरीरम् ॥ २७ ॥

योनिप्राप्तेः पश्चादेवावरोहता शरीरं प्राप्यते ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे तृतीयस्याध्यायस्य प्रथमः पादः ॥

---

27. *Yoneḥ s'arīram*

From the womb the body.

Only after having reached the womb, the descending soul obtains a body.

THUS ENDS THE 1ST PĀDA OF THE 3RD ADHYĀYA.

तृतीयाध्याये द्वितीयः पादः

संध्याधिकरणम् १

संध्ये सृष्टिराह हि ॥ १ ॥

संध्ये स्वप्ने "अथ रथान् रथयोगान् [1]पथः सृजते" इत्यादिनाभिहिता सृष्टिर्जीवकृता। "पुष्करिण्यः स्रवन्त्यः सृजते स हि कर्ता" इति स्वप्नदृशं जीवमेव कर्तारमाह हि[2] श्रुतिः ॥

ADHYĀYA III, PĀDA II

SAMDHYADHIKARAṆA 1

1. *Saṁdhye sṛṣṭirāha hi*

In sleep, the scriptures state, there is creation.

The word '*samdhya*' means 'sleep'. The creation mentioned in the text, 'Then he creats chariots, horses, roads, etc (*Bṛh* IV. 3-10) is effected by the individual self. It is so, because the following scriptural text declares the individual self, the experiencer of the dream, as the creator of what he sees in the sleep—'He creats the tanks and streams, as he is the creator' (*Bṛh.* IV. 3-10).

[1] पथः सृजते omitted M 2, Pr. [2] हि omitted M 1, Pr.

निर्मातारं चैके पुत्रादयश्च ॥ २ ॥

"य एष सुप्तेषु जागर्ति कामं कामं पुरुषो निर्मिमाणः" इत्येनं[1] जीवं स्वाप्नार्थनिर्मातारमेके शाखिनोऽधीयते । अत्र कामशब्दनिर्दिष्टाः काम्यमानतया पुत्रादयः, पूर्वत्र "सर्वान् कामांश्छन्दतः" इति[2] कामशब्दस्य "शतायुषः पुत्रपौत्रान्" इति विवृतत्वात् ॥

मायामात्रं तु, कार्त्स्न्येनानभिव्यक्तस्वरूपत्वात् ॥ ३ ॥

स्वप्ने [3]या रथादिसृष्टिः, तदिदमीश्वरकृतं मायामात्रम् । [4]स्वप्न-

2. *Nirmātāraṁ caike putrādayśca*

And some state that the individual self is the creator and the objects of creation are the sons etc.

The followers of some *S'ākhā* state, in their text, that the individual self is the creator of the objects experienced in dreams The text is this—'He is the person, who is awake among those that sleep and he is creating various *Kāmas* (desired objects)', (*Kath.* II. 2-8). What are meant by the word *Kāmas* here are the sons etc. that are desired ; because in the previous passage it is stated thus—'Ask for all *Kāmas* according to your wish '. It is explained further thus ' Choose sons and grandsons living for hundred years ' (*Kath.* I. 1-23).

3. *Māyāmātraṁ tu, kārtsnyenānabhivyaktasvarūpatvāt*

But it is mere *Māyā* ; on account of his true nature not being fully manifested.

The creation of chariot, etc., in dreams, is effected by the Lord and it is His *Māyā* only. It is experienced only by the

[1] From एनं to अधीयते omitted M 1, 2
[2] इत्युक्त्वा M 1, Pr.
[3] या omitted M 1.
[4] स्वप्नदेशेकेन M 1.

द्रष्टैवानुभाव्यं तत्कालमात्रावसानमित्याश्चर्यतया मायेत्युक्तम्। जीवस्य [1]सत्यसंकल्पत्वादिकं स्वाभाविकं स्वरूपं संसारदशायां कार्त्स्न्येनानभिव्यक्तमिति न तस्य संकल्पमात्रात् सृष्टिरुपपद्यते। "स हि कर्ता" "पुरुषो निर्मिमाणः" [2]इति च न जीवविषयम्, "तस्मिन् लोकः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति कश्चन[3]" इति वचनात्॥

[4]स्वाभाविकस्यानभिव्यक्तौ हेतुमाह[5]—

पराभिध्यानात्तु तिरोहितम्; ततो ह्यस्य बन्धविपर्ययौ॥ ४॥

person who is in dreams and the creation continues only as long as the dream lasts. Hence it is wonderful and is called *Māyā.* True will etc. are the natural characteristics of the individual selves; however, these do not manifest themselves completely when the men are under the influence of *Saṁsāra.* Therefore the creation in dreams is not possible for the selves by their true will. The scriptural texts 'He is the creator' (*Bṛh.* IV-3-10) and 'The person is creating' (*Kath.* II. 2-8), do not refer to the individual selves, because there is the following scriptural text in the same context, 'On Him all the worlds do rest and no one exceeds Him' (*Kath.* II-2-8).

The next *Sūtra* reveals the cause for the non-manifestation of the characteristics though they are natural to the selves:

4. *Parābhidhyānāt tu tirohitaṁ; tato hyasya bandhaviparyayau*

They are hidden on account of the will of the

[1] सत्यसंकल्पादि M 1. [2] च omitted M 1, 2. Pr.
[3] तदु नात्येति कश्चन omitted A 1. M 1. Pr.
[4] स्वाभाविकत्वे A 1. [5] अनभिव्यक्तिमाह M 2.

जीवस्यानाद्यपचारप्रवाहेण पराभिध्यानादेव तिरोहितम्, तदपचारात् तदनुवृत्तेः। ततो ह्यस्य बन्धमोक्षौ,[1] "अथ तस्य भयं भवति" "अथ सोऽभयं गतो भवति" इति श्रुतेः ॥

देहयोगाद्वा सोऽपि ॥ ५ ॥

सोऽपि तिरोभावोऽपि[2] देवमनुष्यादिदेहाकाराचिद्योगात् सृष्टिवेलायाम्; नामरूपविभागानर्हसूक्ष्माकाराचिद्योगात् प्रलये ॥

Highest; because from Him start the bondage and its opposite state of the selves.

The characteristics of the individual selves become concealed on account of the will of the Highest; because the individual selves have committed a series of wrongs, that has not a beginning. On account of the wrongs committed by the individual selves, the Lord's will continues. Indeed, the bondage and liberation of the self do follow His will. The scriptural authorities are these—'Then there is fear for him' (*Tait.* I-2-7). 'Then he becomes free from fear' (*Tait.* I-2-7).

5. *Dehayogād vā sopi*

And that is due to the connection with the body.

The concealment of the natural characteristics of the selves at the time of the creation is due to their connection with *Acit* (the non-sentient *Prakṛti*), that has assumed the form of the bodies of men, gods, etc. At the time of the *Pralaya* (the deluge), the concealment is due to their connection with *Acit* (*Prakṛti*) that has assumed a subtle state which cannot be distinguished in name and form.

[1] विपर्ययौ M 3. Pr. [2] अपि omitted M I, 2. Pr.

सूचकश्च हि श्रुतेः; आचक्षते च तद्विदः ॥ ६ ॥

"अथ स्वप्ने पुरुषं कृष्णम्[1]" इत्यादिश्रुतेः शुभाशुभसूचकश्च हि स्वप्नः। स्वप्नविदश्चाचक्षते तत्[2]। अतो न जीवः स्रष्टा स्वाप्नार्थानाम् ॥

तदभावाधिकरणम् २

तदभावो नाडीषु तच्छ्रुतेरात्मनि च ॥ ७ ॥

स्वप्नाभावः सुषुप्तिः "आसु तदा नाडीषु सुप्तो भवति" "सता

6. *Sūcakaśca hi śruteḥ; ācakṣate ca tadvidaḥ*

And it is suggestive according to scriptures; thus the knowers of the science of the dreams declare.

Indeed, dreams indicate the future auspicious and inauspicious events. This is stated in the text—'Then, if one sees the black person in dream.' etc. Thus declare the knowers of the science of the dreams. Therefore the individual selves are not the creators of the objects seen in dreams.

TADABHĀVĀDHIKARANA 2

7. *Tadabhāvo nāḍīṣu tacchruterātmani ca*

The absence of that dream (*i.e.* the deep sleep) takes place in the *Nāḍīs* and in the Self, as stated in the scriptures.

'The absence of dream' means 'The deep sleep' (*Susupti*). The scriptures say thus—'Then he lies asleep in these *Nāḍīs*' (*Chānd.* VIII-6-3). 'Oh dear, then he

[1] कृष्णदन्तम् added A 1.   [2] तत् omitted M 3.

सोम्य तदा संपन्नो भवति" इति श्रुतेर्नाडीषु परमात्मनि च[1]; "पुरीतति शेते" इति श्रुतेः पुरीतति च। प्रासादखट्वापर्यङ्कवदविरोधः ॥

अतः प्रबोधोऽस्मात् ॥ ८ ॥

"सत आगम्य न विदुः" इति ब्रह्मणः प्रबोधश्रुतिरत एव ॥

कर्मानुस्मृतिशब्दविध्यधिकरणम् ३

स एव तु कर्मानुस्मृतिशब्दविधिभ्यः ॥ ९ ॥

becomes united with the True One' (*Chānd.* VI-8-1). These refer to the *Nādīs* and the Highest Self respectively. And the pericardium (*Purītat*) is mentioned as the place in the text, 'He rests in the pericardium' (*Bṛh.* II-1-19). In mentioning thus, no contradiction arises, because the *Nāḍīs*, *Purītat* (*Pericardium*) and the Highest Self are places of rest in combination, like the palatial buildings, cot and sofa.

8. *Ataḥ probhodosmāt*

Hence the awaking of the individual selves from that *Brahman*.

By this reason the awaking of the individual selves, is declared in the scriptures to take place from the *Brahman*. The scriptural text in question is this—'Though they have come back from the True One, they do not know this fact' (*Chānd.* VI-10-2).

KARMĀNUSMṚTIS'ABDAVIDHYADHIKARANA 3

9. *Sa eva tu karmānusmṛtis'abdavidhibhyaḥ*

But the same person rises; on account of work, remembrance, scriptural text, and injunction.

[1] च omitted Pr.

सता संपन्नोऽपि [1]सुषुप्त एव प्रबुद्ध उत्तिष्ठति, ज्ञानवैधुर्येण कृतस्य कर्मणस्तेनानुभाव्यत्वात्; पूर्वानुभूतप्रत्यभिज्ञानात्; "त इह व्याघ्रो वा" इत्यादि "यद्यद्भवन्ति तथा भवन्ति" इति शब्दात्; मोक्षोपायविध्यानर्थक्याच्च ॥

मुग्धाधिकरणम् ४

मुग्धेऽर्धसंपत्तिः परिशेषात्[2] ॥ १० ॥

मूर्छिते पुरुषे यावस्था, सा मरणायार्धसंपत्तिरिति हेतुभेदादाकारभेदादपुनरुत्थाननियमाभावाच्च ज्ञायते ॥

A person becomes united with the True One in his deep sleep. Yet the same person again rises at the time of waking, because he has to undergo the retribution of the works done previously by want of knowledge. Because also there is the remembrance of the incidents that took place previously. And because it is stated in the scriptural text, beginning with 'whatever they are here, whether a tiger, etc.' and ending with 'whatever they are, thus they become' (*Chānd.* VI-10-2). And because otherwise the injunction of the means for attaining *Mokṣa* (final beatitude) would become meaningless.

MUGDHĀDHIKARAṆA 4

10. *Mughderdhasaṁpattiḥ pariśeṣāt*

In a swooping person there is half-reaching the death; for this is the only course remaining.

In a swooning person a certain state is seen. That state is known as half-reaching the death; because its cause and the form assumed, are distinct from those of other states. It

[1] सुप्तः M 1, 2. Pr. [2] परिश्लेषणात् M 1.

उभयलिङ्गाधिकरणम् ५

न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि ॥ ११ ॥

जागरादिषु [1]चतसृष्ववस्थास्वन्तर्यामित्वेन स्थितेरपि परस्य ब्रह्मणो न कश्चन दोषः । यतः सर्वत्र श्रुतिस्मृतिषु [2]निरस्तनिखिलदोषत्वसमस्त-कल्याणगुणाकरत्वरूपोभयलिङ्गं परं ब्रह्म श्रुतम्—"अपहतपाप्मा सत्य-संकल्पः" "निरवद्यम्" "यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्" "समस्तकल्याणगुणा-त्मकोऽसौ" "सकला न यत्र क्लेशादयः सन्ति" इत्यादिषु ॥

is also because there is no certainty that he will not rise up again.

UBHAYALINGĀDHIKARAṆA 5

11. *Na sthānatopi parasyobhayalingaṁ sarvatra hi*

Not, even on account of residing, is there any imperfection in the Highest Self; for everywhere He is described as having two-fold characteristics.

No imperfection arises in the Highest Self, even though He remains as an inner Ruler in the selves during the four states, such as the waking, etc. In the scriptures and in the *Smṛtis* it is heard that the Highest Self possesses the two fold characteristics, *namely*, the total absence of all the imperfections and the possession of all good qualities. The texts are—'He is free from evil and possesses true will' (*Chānd.* VIII-1-5). 'Without any stain' (*S'vet.* 6-19). 'He, who understands all and knows all' (*Muṇd.* I-1-9). 'He, in nature, is full of all the auspicious qualities' (*Visn. Pu.* VI-5-84). Where all evils, sufferings etc. do not exist' (*Viṣn. Pu.* VI-5-85).

[1] अवस्थास्वन्तरात्मतया समत्वेन स्थितेरपि M 1, तत्सृष्टवस्त्वन्तर्यामित्वेन A 1.

[2] निरस्तनिखिलदोषसंबन्धत्व M 2, Pr.

भेदादिति चेन्न, प्रत्येकमतद्वचनात् ॥ १२ ॥

जीवस्य स्वतोऽपहतपाप्मनोऽपि शरीरसंबन्धित्वावस्थाभेदाद्यथा दोषसंबन्धः, तथा परस्यापि "यस्य पृथिवी शरीरम्" इत्यादिशरीरसंबन्धित्वात् दोष इति चेत्; न, "यस्य पृथिवी शरीरम्" इत्यादिषु प्रतिपर्यायं "स त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृतः" इति निर्दोषत्ववचनात् ॥

अपि चैवमेके ॥ १३ ॥

एकस्मिन् शरीरेऽवस्थितयोर्जीवपरयोर्यो विशेष उक्तः; एवमेके

12. *Bhedādıtı cenna, pratyekamatadvacanāt*

Should it be saıd on account of dıfferent states, the ımperfectıons clıng to Hım; ıt ıs not so, because wıth reference to each of the states, the texts say that the evils are not ın Hım.

The ımperfectıons do clıng to the ındividual selves, though they are ın nature devoıd of those ımperfections; because the selves are connected wıth different bodıes. In the same way the ımperfectıons clıng to the Hıghest Self also, as He ıs connected wıth bodıes as stated ın the text, 'whose body ıs the earth' (*Bṛh.* V-7-3) and so on. It ıs not so. As regards the statement, 'whose body ıs the earth', there ıs the counter-statement, 'He ıs Your Self, the ınner controller and the ımmortal' (*Bṛh.* III-7-3). Thıs statement reveals that He ıs devoıd of ımperfectıons.

13. *Apı caıvameke*

Some also declare thus.

The ındıvidual selves and the Hıghest self are encased in the same body. Yet theır differential characteristıcs are

स्वशब्देनाधीयते—"द्वा सुपर्णा" इत्यारभ्य "पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्न्योऽभिचाकशीति" इति ॥

अरूपवदेव हि, तत्प्रधानत्वात् ॥ १४ ॥

मनुष्यादिशरीरेषु शरीरित्वेऽपि रूपरहितवस्तुवदेव वर्तते तत् ब्रह्म, [1]नामरूपयोर्निर्वोढृत्वेन प्रधानत्वात् । तथाहि श्रुतिः—"नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा" इति । नामरूपयोरन्तरा अस्पृष्टो मध्ये वर्तते; अवश्य इत्यर्थः ॥

stated in the scriptures. Accordingly some texts state in clear words beginning with 'Two birds with beautiful wings' and ending with 'One of them eats the sweet *Pippala* fruit, while the other shines in splendour without eating at all' (*Muṇḍ.* III-1-1).

14. *Arūpavadeva hi, tatpradhānatvāt*

The *Brahman* is altogether like without form, since He is the principal agent with regard to that.

The *Brahman* behaves like a formless object, though He is the Soul, possessed with the bodies of men etc. He is the principal, as He gives names and forms for all objects. The authoritative scriptural text is thus—He is responsible for the name and Form; yet He remains aloof between them, (*Chānd.* VIII-14). 'He remains aloof between them' means 'He is not connected with the name and form.' The purport is 'He is not dependent to others.'

[1] जीवनामरूपयोरपि M 2, 3. Pr,

प्रकाशवच्चावैयर्थ्यात् ॥ १५ ॥

यथा "सत्यं ज्ञानम्" इति वाक्यावैयर्थ्यात् स्वप्रकाशतया ज्ञान-स्वरूपं ब्रह्म, तथा "निरवद्यम्" "यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्" "परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च" इत्यादिपरःशत-वाक्यावैयर्थ्यात् निरवद्यं कल्याणगुणाकरं चेत्युभयलिङ्गमेव ॥

आह च तन्मात्रम् ॥ १६ ॥

"सत्यं ज्ञानम्" इति ज्ञानस्वरूपतामात्रमाह । नान्यन्निवारयति ; अविशेषात्, विरोधाभावाच्च ॥

15. *Prakāśavaccāvaiyarthyāt*

The *Brahman* is of these characteristics like the light, so that the scriptures will not be meaningless.

The scriptural text, 'Truth, knowledge, etc.' (*Tait.* I-2-1-1) is not devoid of meaning. Hence *Brahman* possesses the characteristic of knowledge, as He is self-luminous by nature. So also *Brahman* possesses the two-fold characteristics, ***namely***, 'being devoid of evils' and 'being possessed of good qualities', because the following countless scriptural texts are not devoid of meaning—'He is devoid of evils' (*S'vet.* VI. 19). 'He, who understands all and knows all' (*Muṇḍ.* 1. 10). 'His supreme power is revealed, indeed, as varied and natural. And so are His knowledge, strength and activity' (*S'vet.* VI. 8).

16. *Āha ca tanmātram*

And the text says that only.

The scriptural text, 'Truth, knowledge etc' (*Tait.* I-2-1-1) states only that His natural state is knowledge. It

दर्शयति चाथो अपि स्मर्यते ॥ १७ ॥

दर्शयति च निर्दोषत्वं कल्याणगुणाकरत्वं च वेदान्तगणः "निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तम्[1]" "तमीश्वराणां परमं महेश्वरम्" इत्यादिः । "यो मामजमनादिम्" इत्यादिना स्मर्यते च तत् ॥

अत एव चोपमा सूर्यकादिवत् ॥ १८ ॥

यतः पृथिव्यादौ [2]सर्वत्र स्थितस्यापि निर्दोषत्वं कल्याणगुणाकरत्वं

does not exclude anything more, because there is no any reason for such a discrimination and there is no any contradiction.

17. *Dars'ayati catho api smaryate*

This is seen in the scriptures and also in the *Smṛtis.*

The string of the scriptural texts shows that the *Brahman* is devoid of imperfections and is full of good qualities. The texts are 'He is without parts, without activity, tranquil' (*S'vet.* VI. 19). 'He is the Great and Supreme Lord of the lords' (*S'vet.* VI. 7) etc. The Smṛti text is this,—'He, who knows Me unborn, beginningless etc.' (*Bhag. Gī.* X. 3).

18. *Ata evacopamā sūryakādivat*

For this very reason, comparisons, such as reflected images of the sun and the like, are mentioned in the scriptures.

The *Brahman* is devoid of evils and He is the mine of many good qualities, though He remains everywhere in the earth, etc. Hence in the following scriptures the

[1] शान्तम् omitted M 3, [2] सर्वत्रावस्थितस्यापि A 1,

च, अत एव शास्त्रेषु [1]जलसूर्यकादिवदित्युपमा, "आकाशमेकं हि यथा+जलाधारेष्विवांशुमान्" इति ॥

चोदयति—

अम्बुवदग्रहणात्तु न तथात्वम् ॥ १९ ॥

अम्बुनि सूर्यो यथा गृह्यते, न तथा परमात्मा पृथिव्यादौ । अत्र परमार्थतः स्थितः । अतो न निर्दोषत्वमिति[2] ॥

परिहरति—

वृद्धिह्रासभाक्त्वमन्तर्भावादुभयसामञ्जस्यादेवं दर्शनाच्च ॥ २० ॥

comparisons, such as reflected images of the sun in the water etc. are mentioned in the scriptures—'Just as the ether, is one and the same without change even it becomes encased in the pots etc. and just as the sun reflected in water.' (*Yājñ. Smṛ. Prā.* 144.)

Then puts the following objection—

19. *Ambuvadagrahaṇāt tu na tathātvam*

But the case is not so, because He is not apprehended there like the sun in the water.

The question here is this—The sun is apprehended as reflected in the waters. In the same way the Highest self is not apprehended in earth etc. But here He remains actually. Therefore He is not devoid of evils.

Then refutes the objection—

20. *Vṛddhihrāsabhāktvamantarbhāvādubhaya-sāmañjasyādevaṁ darśanācca*

The participation of the *Brahman* in the increase and decrease due to His abiding within, is denied; on

[1] जलसूर्याकाशादिवत् A 1. [2] इति omitted M 3.

नेति वर्तते[1]। नैवम्। पृथिव्यादिष्वन्तर्भावात् परस्य तद्गतवृद्धिह्रासभाक्त्वमात्रं[2] दृष्टान्तेन निवर्त्यत [3]इत्युभयदृष्टान्तोपादानसामञ्जस्यादवगम्यते। "आकाशमेकं हि यथा" इति वस्तुतः स्थितमाकाशं वस्तुतोऽनवस्थितं च सूर्यकमुभयमुपादत्ते, अनवस्थितस्य[4] यथा न दोषस्पर्शस्तथा स्थितस्यापि हेत्वभावादिति ज्ञापयितुम्। विवक्षितधर्मसाम्यज्ञापनाय 'सिंह इव' इति दृष्टान्तो दृश्यते।

account of the appropriateness of both (comparisons) and because it is seen thus.

The word 'not' is supplied from the last *Sūtra*. It is not so. The Highest Self dwells within the earth, etc. as an immanent ruler. The illustrative example only denies the increase and decrease on His part due to such dwelling. This is understood in this way, because then only the two illustrative examples in the context could be reconciled. The spatial ether actually remains in the pot etc. on the other hand the sun does not actually remain in the water. This fact is stated in the scriptural text 'Indeed, as one and the same spatial ether' (*Yājñ. Smṛ. Prā.* 144). The purpose of these two examples is to show that just as the object actually not present is not stained by imperfections, so also the object actually present is not stained by imperfections for want of reasons. The examples are meant to teach this fact alone. Consider the illustrative example 'The boy is like a lion'. This brings to our mind the similarity, only in regard to some of the attributes meant to refer.

[1] अनुवर्तते A 1. [2] मात्रं omitted M 2, Pr.
[3] इति दृष्टान्तद्वयोपादान A 1. [4] अस्थितस्य A 1, M 2.

अथवा—दर्शनाच्चेति; "अश्व इव रोमाणि विधूय पापम्" इत्यादौ विवक्षितधर्मसाम्यान्वयो[1] हि दार्ष्टान्तिके दृश्यते। अश्वो हि रोमाणि सहजानि [2]स्वावयवभूतानि मूर्तद्रव्याणि [3]स्वशरीरं कम्पयन् कानिचिन्मुञ्चति। आत्मा तु स्वेन कदाचिदनुष्ठितानि क्षणध्वंसितया विनष्टानि कर्माणि भगवदप्रीतिकराणीति भगवता [4]स्वाप्रीतिकृतदुःखानि दातुं प्रवृत्तेनोपासनप्रीतिकृतानुग्रहान्निवर्तितानीति तत्संपर्काभावमनुसंदधातीति॥

"अथात आदेशो नेति नेति" इति सकलविशेषप्रतिषेधात् नोभयलिङ्गमित्यत[5] आह—

Or the word 'Dars'anāt' may be interpreted in different way as recorded in the scriptural text 'Like the horse that gives up its hair by shaking the body, he gives up the sins (*Pāpa*)' (*Chānd.* VIII, 13). The horse by shaking the body gives up some of the solid substances *i.e.* hairs that are natural to it and constitute part of its body. But the self once did evil works which though perished in a moment, created displeasure to the Lord. The Lord began to give him pains that were effected by His displeasure. But these pains could be got rid of through His grace produced by affection caused by the meditation. Hence non-attachment of evils is what is thought of here.

Here the following objection arises—The *Brahman* does not possess the two-fold characteristics; because His having attributes has been denied in the scriptural text, 'Then this is the injunction, *namely* 'not that, not that' (*Bṛh.* II. 3-6).

The reply is this—

[1] साम्य A 1. [2] स्वभाव A 1, [3] स्व omitted A 1.
[4] स्वाप्रीतिकर M 3. [5] इत्यत्राह M 1.

प्रकृतैतावत्त्वं हि प्रतिषेधति; ततो ब्रवीति च भूयः ॥ २१ ॥

"द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे" इत्यारभ्य कृत्स्नप्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मणो रूपत्वेनाप्रज्ञातस्य रूपत्वमुपदिश्य पुनस्तस्यैव प्रतिषेधासंभवात् प्रकृतैतावन्मात्रं न भवति ब्रह्मेति ब्रह्मणो प्रकृतेयत्तां "नेति नेति" इति प्रतिषेधति। ततः पश्चात् पूर्वमनुक्तं गुणगणं ब्रवीति च—"न ह्येतस्मादिति नेत्यन्यत्परमस्ति" इति। 'इति न' इति निर्दिष्टाद्ब्रह्मणोऽन्यन्न ह्यस्त्युत्कृष्टम्। "अथ नामधेयं सत्यस्य सत्यम्" इति च। तन्निर्वचनम्—"प्राणा वै सत्यं

21. *Prakṛtaitāvattvaṁ hi pratiṣedhati ; tato bravīti ca bhūyaḥ*

For, the text denies His limitedness supposed to be apprehended in the context and it declares also more than that.

It has been taught in the scriptural text beginning with 'There are two-fold forms of the *Brahman*' (*Brh.* II. 3-1), that the whole world is the form of the *Brahman*, as this truth was not known previously by other means. Therefore this truth cannot be denied immedaitely by the subsequent passage of the same text. Therefore the statement, 'Not that, not that' denies the so-muchness of the *Brahman* to purport that the *Brahman's* attributes are not only those mentioned in previous passage; but there are more also. Then the text also states the host of His qualities not stated above, in the passages—'There is none Great' except the *Brahman*, who is denoted by the words, 'not that' (*Bṛh.* II. 3-6). Then there is the text, 'Then He has the name Real of the Real' (*Bṛh.* II. 3-6). Then its explanation given is this—'*Prāṇas*

तेषामेष सत्यम्" इति । प्राणा [1]जीवात्मानो वियदादिवदुत्पत्त्यभावात् सत्यम् । तेषामेष सत्यम्; तेभ्योऽप्येष सत्यम्, ज्ञानसंकोचाद्यभावात् । अतः [2]प्रकृतैयत्तामात्रप्रतिषेधादुभयलिङ्गमेव ब्रह्म[3] ॥

प्रत्यक्षेण सन्मात्रं ब्रह्मैव गृह्यते; अन्यत् सर्वं भ्रान्तमिति "नेति नेति" इति निषेधार्थं [4]इत्यत आह—

तदव्यक्तमाह हि ॥ २२ ॥

ब्रह्मस्वरूपं न केनापि प्रमाणेन व्यज्यते । तथाह हि श्रुतिगणः—

are true. Than them, this (Highest Self) is more true (*Bṛh.* II. 3-6). Here the word *Prāṇas* denotes the selves. They are real because they are not created like the ether etc. Than these selves, the Highest Self is the Greater Truth, because His knowledge has no shrinking and other changes. Hence the *Brahman* is said to possess the two-fold characteristics, because His so-muchness only has been denied in the scriptural text.

By the proof of perception is apprehended the *Brahman* only, who is merely *sat* (existence) All the rest are illusory. This is the meaning of the statement, of denial 'Not that, not that'. (*Bṛh.* II. 3-6). To this objection the reply is this—

22. *Tadavyaktamāha hi*

That (*Brahman*) is unmanifested; for, so the scripture declares.

The essential nature of the *Brahman* cannot be manifested by any of the proofs. The scriptural texts state thus—

[1] जीवाः M 2. [2] मात्र omitted A 1, Pr.
[3] ब्रह्म omitted A 1, M 1, Pr. [4] इत्यत्राह M 1,

"न संदृशे तिष्ठति रूपमस्य न चक्षुषा पश्यति कश्चनैनम्" इत्यादिः। प्रत्यक्षादिना तु [1]घटादेरेवास्तित्वं गृह्यते, न ब्रह्मणः॥

अपि संराधने प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम्॥ २३॥

अपि चात्यर्थप्रियानुध्यानरूपसम्यक्प्रीणने सति ब्रह्मस्वरूपं गृह्यत इति श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यामवगम्यते। "नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यः" इति श्रुतिः। "नाहं वेदैः" इत्यादिः स्मृतिः॥

प्रकाशादिवच्चावैशेष्यम्; प्रकाशश्च कर्मण्यभ्यासात्॥२४॥

'His form is not in the scope of perception. No one sees Him with eyes' (*Tait.* II. 1-10) and so on. By the proof of perception is apprehended the existence of pot and other objects only and not of the *Brahman.*

23. *Api samrādhane pratyakṣānumānābhyām*

And in perfect endearment the intuition of *Brahman* takes place, according to scriptures and *Smṛti* texts.

There must be the uninterrupted meditation, which gives the extreme happiness to the worshipper and by which the *Brahman* becomes pleased. Then will be apprehended the essential nature of the *Brahman.* The scriptural text is this—'This Self is not reached by instruction' (*Kath.* I-2-23). The *Smṛti* text is this 'Nor can I be seen by the study of the vedas, etc.' (*Bhag Gī.* XI-53).

24. *Prakāśādivaccāvaiśeṣyam; prakāśaśca karmaṇyabhyāsāt*

As in the case of light (knowledge) etc. there is no any discrimination among the qualities of the *Brahman*

[1] पदादेः M.1, 2, Pr.

संराधनकर्मण्यभ्यासाद्येषां ब्रह्मस्वरूपदर्शनं जातं तद्दर्शने ज्ञानानन्दादेरिव [1]जगदैश्वर्यस्याप्यवैशेष्यं प्रतीयते "अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्च" इत्यादौ ॥

अतोऽनन्तेन ; तथाहि लिङ्गम् ॥ २५ ॥

अतो "द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे" इत्यादिनोपदिष्टेनानन्तेन कल्याणगुणगणेन योगो ब्रह्मणः सिद्धः । तथा सत्युभयलिङ्गमेव ब्रह्म ॥

in respect of their being apprehended. The apprehension takes place by the means of uninterrupted practice of meditation.

As regards the perfect endearment, the practice of meditation must be repeated. Then in the devotee is produced the apprehension of the essential nature of the *Brahman*. Then what are apprehended here are all the attributes of *Brahman*, such as knowledge, bliss and the wealth of the world, without any discrimination. This has been stated thus: 'I have become *Manu* and the Sun' (*Bṛh.* I-4-10).

25. *Atonantena*; *tathāhi lingam*

Hence (*Brahman* is characterised) with endless qualities; thus His characteristics hold good.

In the *Brahman* are established the endless auspicious qualities taught in the scriptural text, 'There are two-fold forms of the *Brahman*' (*Bṛh.* II-3-1) That being the case the *Brahman* invariably possesses the two-fold characteristics,

[1] जगदैश्वर्यस्यावैशेष्यं A 1, Pr.

अहिकुण्डलाधिकरणम् ६

उभयव्यपदेशात्त्वहिकुण्डलवत् ॥ २६ ॥

"आत्मैवेदं सर्वम्" "अस्मान्मायी सृजते" इत्येकत्वनानात्वव्यपदेशात्, अहेः कुण्डलभावादिवत् ब्रह्मस्वरूपस्यैव "द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे" इत्यादिनोक्तः पृथिव्यादिभावः ॥

प्रकाशाश्रयवद्वा तेजस्त्वात् ॥ २७ ॥

प्रकाशतदाश्रययोर्यथा स्वरूपभेदेऽपि तेजस्त्वयोगेनैक्यम्, एवमचिद्ब्रह्मणोश्चैकजातियोगेन ॥

AHIKUNDALĀDHIKARANA 6

26. *Ubhayavyapades'āttvahikuṇḍalavat*

But this is on account of the two-fold designation, as the coil of the snake.

He is taught to be both one and different in the scriptural texts, 'The Self only is all this' (*Chānd.* VII-23-2). 'The wonderful maker projects from this' (*S've.* IV-9). The states of being in the form of earth etc. are the essential nature of the *Brahman* in the same way as the coils are of the snake. This is stated in the text, 'Surely there are two-fold forms of the *Brahman*' (*Brh.* II-3-1).

27. *Prakās'ās'rayavādvā tejastāt*

Or else like the light and its abode, (both) being light.

Though their essential characteristics appear to be different, the brightness and its abode are one because they both possess the nature of brightness. Same is the case with the non-sentient beings (*acit*) and the *Brahman*, as they both belong to the same class.

पूर्ववद्वा ॥ २८ ॥

वाशब्दः [1]पक्षद्वयव्यावृत्त्यर्थः । यथा पूर्वत्र जीवस्य प्रकाशजातिगुणशरीरवद्विशेषणतैकस्वभावतया विशिष्टैकदेशत्वेनांशत्वम्, एवमचिद्वस्तुनोऽपि "आत्मैवेदं सर्वम्" इति चिदचितोरेकेनैव शब्देनैक्याभिधानमित्यंशत्वमप्येकरूपमिति[2] 'पूर्ववद्वा' इत्युक्तम् । [3]इतरपक्षयोर्ब्रह्मणः सदोषतादि दुर्वारमित्यर्थः । "यस्य पृथिवी शरीरम्" "यस्यात्मा शरीरम्" इति चिदचिद्वस्तुनोः शरीरतया तद्विशेषणस्वभावता[4] सिद्धा ॥

28. *Pūrvavad vā*

Or in the manner stated above.

The word, 'Or' is used in the sense of discarding the two alternative views mentioned above. It has been stated in a previous occasion that the individual selves are the parts of the *Brahman*, who is inseparably connected with them. The individual selves are of the nature of adjectives to the *Brahman* like the light, class, quality and body are to the respective objects. Same is the case with the non-sentient beings also; because the sentient and the non-sentient beings nre regarded to be one with the *Brahman* by the use of a common term in the text, 'Verily the Self is this whole world' (*Chānd.* VII-25-2) As regards the other two alternatives, it is not possible to set aside the faults, that happen to be in the *Brahman*. It has been proved in the scriptural texts, that the sentient and the non-sentient beings have the character of adjectives; because they are considered as the body of the *Brahman* 'To whom earth is the body' (*Bṛh.* III-7-3) 'To whom the self is the body' (*Bṛh.* III-7-3. Mādhy.).

[1] द्वय omitted A 1.
[2] एकरूपमेवेति M 3.
[3] अवस्थाभेदयोगपक्षे एकजाति योगपक्षे चेत्यर्थः ।
[4] तद्विशेषणता M 2.

प्रतिषेधाच्च ॥ २९ ॥

"नास्य जरयैतज्जीर्यति[1]" इत्यादिनाचिद्धर्मप्रतिषेधाच्चैवम् ॥

पराधिकरणम् ७

"जन्माद्यस्य यतः" इत्यादिना "प्रतिषेधाच्च" इत्येतदन्तेन यत्परमकारणं [2]परं ब्रह्म प्रतिपादितम्, अतः परमपि किंचित्तत्त्वमस्तीति युक्त्याभासेनाशङ्क्यते[3]—

परमतः सेतून्मानसंबन्धभेदव्यपदेशेभ्यः ॥ ३० ॥

29. *Pratiṣedhācca*

And on account of the denial of the characteristics of the non-sentient beings in the *Brahman.*

The characteristics of the non-sentient beings are denied in the *Brahman* in the scriptural text, 'This *Brahman* does not become old, on account of the body's becoming old' (*Chānd.* VIII-1-5).

PARĀDHIKARAṆA 7

In the *Sūtras* 1-1-2 to III-2-29, the Supreme *Brahman* is stated to be the primeval cause of the universe. Now a doubt arises due to some erroneous reasonings that there is some thing higher than this *Brahman.* This doubt has been introduced in the *Sūtra*—

30. *Paramataḥ setūnmānasaṁbandhabheda-vyapadeśebhyaḥ*

There is something higher than this, on account of the designations of the bridge, measure, connection and difference.

[1] जीर्यते A 1, M 1, 3. [2] परं omitted M 1. 2. Pr. [3] शङ्क्यते M 2, 3.

"अथ य आत्मा स सेतुः" "एतं सेतुं तीर्त्वा" "चतुष्पाद् ब्रह्म[1]" "अमृतस्यैष सेतुः" इत्यादिभिरस्य ब्रह्मणः सेतुत्वतरितव्यत्वपरिमितत्वप्रापकत्वव्यपदेशेभ्यः "तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम्। ततो यदुत्तरतरम्" इत्येतस्मात् [2]अर्थादुत्तरतत्त्वव्यपदेशाच्चान्यत्परमस्तीति ॥

सामान्यात्तु ॥ ३१ ॥

तुशब्देनैतद्व्यावर्तयति। नैतद्युक्तम्। [3]कुतः "न ह्येतस्मादिति नेत्यन्यत्परमस्ति" इति मूर्तामूर्तप्रपञ्चप्रकारतया तद्विशिष्टात् 'इति न'

The scriptures teach that (*a*) He is the bridge, (*b*) He is to be crossed, (*c*) He is measured, (*d*) He leads men for attainment of the bliss. The scriptures are—'Now the Self is the bridge' (*Chānd.* VIII-4-1). 'Having crossed that bridge' (*Chānd.* VIII-4-2). 'The *Brahman* has four feet' (*Chānd.* III-18-2), 'He is the bridge that leads to immortality' (*Mund.* II-4-5). There are also other texts—'By this Person this whole universe is filled. That which is above this. (*S've.* III and 10). Thus it is understood that there is another entity which is higher than the *Brahman*.

31. *Sāmānyāt tu*

But on account of the usage on resemblance.

The word, 'but' refutes the allegations made in the previous *Sūtra*. What is stated above is not correct. Why? Because there are thousands of scriptural texts denying the existence of what is highest apart from the *Brahman* mentioned in the words 'not that' and possessed of the universe with and without forms as adjectives. The text is this—'There is none

[1] तद्ब्रह्म M 2. [2] अर्थान्तरव्यपदेशाच्च M 2. Pr. [3] कुतः omitted A 1.

इति निर्दिष्टात् ब्रह्मणोऽन्यत्परं नास्तीत्यादिनिषेधसहस्रात् । परस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि सेतुत्वव्यपदेशः प्रशासनात् सर्वलोकासंकरकरत्वेन सेतुसामान्यात् । तथाह—"अथ[1] य आत्मा स सेतुर्विधृतिरेषां लोकानामसंभेदाय" इति । "सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म तज्जलानिति शान्त उपासीत" इत्यारभ्योक्तजगन्निमित्तोपादानभूतस्यैव ब्रह्मणः "एतमितः प्रेत्याभिसंभवितास्मि" इति परमप्राप्यत्ववचनात् तरतिरपि प्राप्तिवचनः ॥

बुद्ध्यर्थः पादवत् ॥ ३२ ॥

Highest except this Self that is mentioned in the words 'not that' (*Bṛh.* II-3-6). The Highest *Brahman* is designated as bridge on His resemblance with bridge: because as the ruler, He prevents the admixture of the worlds. Accordingly the following scripture says—'Now, the Self is the bridge and support, in order to prevent confusion in these worlds' (*Chānd.* VIII-4-1). The *Brahman* alone, who is the instrumental cause and the material cause of the world is to be attained as the Highest object. This is stated in the scriptural text beginning with: 'All this world is the *Brahman.* He is its creator, destroyer and protector. He is thus to be meditated upon with a calm mind' (*Chānd.* III-14-1) and ending with 'I shall reach Him after departing hence' (*Chānd.* III-14-4). The expression 'He has to be crossed' means 'He has to be reached'.

32. *Buddhyarthaḥ pādavat*

The scriptures speak of the *Brahman* like this, for the purpose of meditation as in the case of the quarter.

[1] अथ omitted M 3

"चतुष्पात्" इत्युन्मानव्यपदेशोऽपि "वाक्पादश्चक्षुष्पादः" इतिवदुपासनार्थः ॥

स्थानविशेषात्प्रकाशादिवत् ॥ ३३ ॥

अपरिमितस्यापि स्थानविशेषसंबन्धादवच्छिद्यानुसंधानं युज्यते, [1]प्रकाशाकाशादेरिव विततस्यापि वातायनघटादिना ॥

उपपत्तेश्च ॥ ३४ ॥

प्राप्यस्यैव परमात्मनः प्रापकत्वोपपत्तेः; यथाह—"यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यः" इति ॥

The designation of measure made in the scriptural text, 'That has four quarters' (*Chānd.* III-18-2) is intended only for meditation, as in the case of the text, 'Speech is one quarter . . . eye is one quarter' (*Chānd.* III-18-2).

33. *Sthānaviśeṣāt prakāsādivat*

Owing to the *Brahman* being associated with particular places, as in the case of light, etc.

It is right to meditate upon the immeasurable *Brahman* by connecting Him with particular places. The light and the spatial ether, etc. can be apprehended as that which passes through the window and that which is encased within the pot respectively.

34. *Upapatteśca*

And on account of its possibility.

It is possible to hold that the Highest Self, who is to be attained, is also the means of attainment. The scriptural text states thus, 'whomsoever He chooses, by him alone He can be reached' (*Muṇd.* III. 2-3).

[1] प्रकाशादेरिव A 1, M 1,

तथान्यप्रतिषेधात् ॥ ३५ ॥

"यस्मात्परं नापरमस्ति किंचिद्यस्मान्नाणीयो न ज्यायोऽस्ति कश्चित्" इत्यस्मिन् वाक्ये पुरुषादन्यस्य [1]ज्यायस्त्वप्रतिषेधादितोऽधिकं नास्ति। "ततो यदुत्तरतरम्" इति तु यतः[2] पुरुषतत्त्वादन्यदुत्कृष्टं नास्ति, तत उत्तरतरं पुरुषतत्त्वमेव "अरूपमनामयम्; य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्त्यथेतरे दुःखमेवापि यन्ति" इत्युपक्रमप्रतिज्ञातं सहेतुकमुपसंहृतम्। "तमेव विदित्वातिमृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्थाः" इत्युपक्रमे प्रतिज्ञातम्। अन्यथोपक्रमविरोधश्च[3] ॥

35. *Tathānyapratiṣedhāt*

And on account of anything else being denied in this context.

Except Him there is no other Highest Person, because there is the denial of a highest person other than Him in the scriptural text, 'Except whom there is nothing highest and excedpt whom there is nothing smallest or largest' (*S'vet.* III-9-7). But there is another text, 'Tato yaduttaratataram' (*S'vet.* III-10-7). The meaning of this text is this—There is none Higest except the Purusatattva (the Reality of the Supreme Person). Therefore the same Reality that is referred to in the beginning of the context, is described in the concluding portion of the context thus 'He is without form and without evil. Those, who know Him, become Immortal. The others suffer pain' (*S'vet.* III-10). Thus has been concluded with reason. The proposition that was made in the beginning is this, 'Having known Him thus, the self reaches something beyond death. There is no other path' (*S'vet.* III 8). Otherwise there will be contradiction to what is stated in the beginning.

[1] ज्यायस; A 1. [2] तु यतः omitted M 1, 2. [3] विरोधाच्च M 3.

अनेन सर्वगतत्वमायामशब्दादिभ्यः ॥ ३६ ॥

"अणोरणीयान्महतो महीयान्" "तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम्" "व्याप्य नारायणः स्थितः" "नित्यं विभुं सर्वगतं सुसूक्ष्मम्" इत्यादि-शब्दैरनेन ब्रह्मणा स्वव्यतिरिक्ततत्त्वस्य व्याप्यत्वमवगतम्। तच्च तस्मात्परं वारयति ॥

फलाधिकरणम् ८

फलमत उपपत्तेः ॥ ३७ ॥

अतः परस्माद्ब्रह्मण एव कर्मभिरुपासनेन चाराधितात् भोगापवर्ग-

36. *Anena sarvagatatvamāyāmas'abdādibhyaḥ*

Omnipresence of that *Brahman*, is understood from the declaration of His extending etc.

This *Brahman* pervades all other objects. This is stated in the following scriptural texts—'He is more minute than the minute. He is more great than the great.' (*Kath.* I-2-20). 'All these are filled by that Person' (*S'vet.* III-9). '*Nārāyāṇa* remains pervading everything' (*Tait.* 11-7). 'The eternal, All-pervading, Omnipresent, and Exceedingly Subtle' (*Mund.* I-1-6). The above mentioned fact denies the existence of higher than Him.

PHALĀDHIKARAṆA 8

37. *Phalamata upapatteḥ*

From Him start the rewards of worships; on account of possibility.

'From Him' means 'from the Highest *Brahman* alone.' The worldly pleasures and the final release start from Him only

रूपफलं सिध्यति। कर्म क्षणध्वंसि न कालान्तरभाविफलायालमिति सर्वज्ञात् परमकारुणिकात्[1] फलसिद्धिरुपपद्यते ॥

श्रुतत्वाच्च ॥ ३८ ॥

श्रुतमेव हि "अन्नादो वसुदानः" "एष ह्येवानन्दयाति" इत्यस्यैव फलदायित्वम् ॥

धर्मं जैमिनिरत एव ॥ ३९ ॥

धर्ममेव, अत उपपत्तेः श्रुतत्वाच्च, फलदायिनं जैमिनिर्मेने[2]।

who is pleased by the worships and meditation. All the works are perishable in a moment As such they are not capable of yielding the fruits in a subsequent time. Therefore it is appropriate to hold that the rewards are the effect of the grace of the all knowing *Brahman*.

38. *S'rutatvācca*

And it is so heard from the scriptural statement.

He bestows all rewards because the scriptures also declare so. 'He is the eater of food and the giver of wealth' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-24). and 'Indeed, He alone gives the delight' (*Tait.* I-11-7).

39. *Dharmaṁ Jaiminirata eva*

For the same reasons *Jaimini* thinks it to be the religious work.

'For the same reasons' means 'On account of possibility and the scriptural statements'. The religious works alone

[1] हि added after, A 1.

[2] जैमिनिर्मुनिर्मेने M 2

उपपत्तिस्तु कृष्यादेर्मर्दनादेश्च कर्मणः साक्षात्परंपरया वा फलसिद्धिदर्शनम् । श्रुतत्वं च कामिनः कर्तव्यतया कर्मविधानान्यथानुपपत्त्या कर्मैवापूर्वद्वारेण तत्तत्फलसाधनमिति निश्चयः ॥

पूर्वं तु बादरायणो हेतुव्यपदेशात् ॥ ४० ॥

पूर्वोक्तं परमपुरुषस्यैव फलदायित्वं भगवान् बादरायणो मन्यते, "वायव्यं श्वेतमालभेत" इत्यादिषु "स एवैनं भूतिं गमयति" इति भगवदात्मकतया वाय्वादेः कर्मविधिष्वेव फलहेतुत्वव्यपदेशात् । वाक्य-

bring about their rewards. Thus *Jaimini* thought. The possibility is thus—It is seen that the labour of agriculture and trampling bring about their rewards directly or indirectly. The scriptural statements are the injunctions that ordain men to do certain works. As there is no other way to hold the injunctions effective, it must be decided that the works themselves grant the rewards through what is called ***Apūrva.***

40. *Pūrvaṁ tu Bādarāyaṇo hetuvyapadeśāt*

But *Bhādarāyaṇa* holds the former view, on account of the designation as the cause.

The revered *Bhādarāyāna* thinks that the Supreme Person alone grants the rewards as stated before. 'Let him, who is desirous of getting prosperity, offer a white animal to the deity Vāyu (wind)' (*Tait. Sam.* II-1-1). 'He alone leads him to prosperity' (*Tait. Saṁ.* II-1-1). These scriptural texts themselves in ordaining certain rituals teach that the deity Vāyu and so on, grant the rewards to men, because they have the Lord as their Self. There is an established

शेषस्थं च[1] विध्यपेक्षितं[2] "प्रतितिष्ठन्ति ह वा" इत्यादिषु स्वीक्रियते। "यो वायौ तिष्ठन्" इति हि श्रूयते ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे तृतीयस्याध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः

---

philosophical rule, *namely*, if anything is wanted to make the scriptural ordinance sensible, it should be supplied from the other source of a similar scriptural passage. This principle has been adopted in respect of the passage 'They obtain a good renown'. The other source meant in question of the present topic is 'Who remaining in the wind' (*Bṛh.* III-7-7).

THUS ENDS THE 2ND PĀDA OF THE 3RD ADHYĀYA.

---

[1] च omitted Pr. [2] हि added after, A 1, M 2, Pr.

तृतीयाध्याये तृतीयः पादः

सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययाधिकरणम् १

सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययं चोदनाद्यविशेषात् ॥ १ ॥

सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययं दहराद्युपासनमेकमेव[1], 'विद्यात्, उपासीत' इति कर्मविधिष्विव चोदनाफलसंयोगरूपाख्यानामविशेषात् ॥

ADHYĀYA III, PĀDA III

SARVAVEDĀNTAPRATYAYĀDHIKARANA 1

1. *Sarvavedāntapratyayaṁ codanādyaviśeṣāt*

What is understood from all *Vedānta* texts is one, on account of there being no difference in injunctions, etc.

Each of the *Upāsanas* (meditations) *Dahara* etc., though taught in different texts, is one and the same; because the injunctions, such as 'should know, should meditate', the results, the forms and the names are common. This is similar to the case of the works ordained in Vedic texts.

[1] एकैव विद्या A 1.

भेदान्नेति चेदेकस्यामपि ॥ २ ॥

अविशेषपुनःश्रुतिर्भेदापादिकेति[1] न विद्यैक्यमिति चेत्, विद्यैक्येऽपि शाखान्तरे प्रतिपत्तृभेदान्न भेदः ॥

स्वाध्यायस्य; तथात्वे हि समाचारेऽधिकाराच्च सववच्च तन्नियमः ॥ ३ ॥

2. *Bhedānneticedekasyāmapi*

If it be said that the *Vidyās* are not one on account of different mentioning, we deny this, since it is even in one.

The *Vidyās* are not one; because the same matter repeated in the texts without difference, proves the object of injunction to be different. It is not so. No difference is apprehended in the object of injunctions; because the same *Vidyā* could be repeated in different *S'ākhās* for the benefit of different cognising agents

3. *Svādhyāyasya; tathātvehi samācaredhikarācca savavacca tanniyamaḥ*

Indeed, *S'irovrata* is a part of the mode of the study of the *veda*, because then only its unavoidability could be maintained; moreover this is so mentioned in the work called *Samācāra.* The rule laid down for it, is similar to that in the case of the *Sava* homa.

[1] श्रुतेर्भेदादिति M 3.

[1]अथर्ववेदे "तेषामेवैतां ब्रह्मविद्यां वदेत" इति शिरोव्रतवतां नियमः शिरोव्रतस्य स्वाध्यायाङ्गत्वेन, "नैतदचीर्णव्रतोऽधीयीत" इति तस्याध्ययनसंबन्धावगमात्; [2]समाचाराख्यग्रन्थे "[3]इदमपि वेदव्रतेन व्याख्यातम्" इति वेदव्रतत्वावगमाच्च। 'ब्रह्मविद्याम्' इत्यत्र ब्रह्मशब्दो वेदविषयः। यथा सवहोमास्तेषामेव, तथा [4]शिरोव्रतमपीति तन्न विद्याभेदलिङ्गम् ॥

दर्शयति च ॥ ४ ॥

श्रुतिरेव विद्यैक्यं दर्शयति। छान्दोग्ये दहरविद्योक्तं गुणाष्टकं तैत्तिरीयके केवलं "तस्मिन्यदन्तः" इति वदति ॥

The compulsory rule as regards those, who resort to *S'irovrata* (*i.e.*, vow of the head) has been given in the *Atharva-Veda* thus—'To him alone the knowledge of the *Brahman* must be revealed' That *S'irovrata* forms a part of the mode of the study of the *Vedas*, is revealed by the scriptural text that connects it with the study of the *Vedas*, 'This should not be studied by one, who has broken the vow'. In the work called, *Samācāra* it has been stated thus—'This has been commented upon by the *Vedavrata*' (*i.e*, the vow of the study of *Vedas*). The word, *Brahman*, used in the expression *Brahmavidyā*, refers to the *Vedas*. *S'irovrata* belongs to them only (Ātharvanikas,) just as the *Savahoma*. Hence there is nothing to indicate that they are different *Vidyās*.

4. *Dars'ayatica*

And the scriptures reveal thus.

[1] आथर्वण Pr.
[2] समाचाराख्ये A 1, M 2.
[3] इदमपि omitted M 3.
[4] शिरोव्रतमिति A 1, Pr.

उपसंहारोऽर्थाभेदाद्विधिशेषवत्समाने च ॥ ५ ॥

एवं सर्वत्र विद्यैक्येऽन्यत्रोक्तानामन्यत्रोपसंहारः, तद्विद्योपकाररूपार्थैक्यात्, यथैकविधिशेषतया [1]विहिताङ्गानामिति ॥

अन्यथात्वाधिकरणम् २

पूर्वकाण्डोक्तं [2]स्वीकृत्यात्र वक्तव्यमाह—

The scriptural statements, themselves reveal the oneness of the *Vidyās*. In the *Daharavidyā* of *Chāndogayopaniṣad*, eight qualities of the *Brahman* are mentioned. But in the *Taittirīyopanisad* they are merely referred to thus:—'That which is within the *Brahman*'. (*Tait.* II-10-23).

5 *Upasaṁhārorthābhedād vidhiśeṣavat samāneca*

Meditations thus being one and the same, there is combination of qualities; on account of non-difference of the purpose as in the case of what subserves injunction.

Thus the *Vidyās* with the same titles being the same, the qualities mentioned in one text are to be combined with those mentioned in another, on account of non-difference of purpose. This is as in the case of those which subserve the object of a single injunction.

ANYATHĀTVĀDHIKARANA 2

Having accepted what is stated in *Pūrvakāṇḍa* (*i.e.*, the *Pūrvamīmāmsā*) the Sūtrakāra proceeds.

[1] विहितानामङ्गानामिति M 3.   [2] स्थिरीकृत्य M 1, 2.

अन्यथात्वं शब्दादिति चेन्नाविशेषात् ॥ ६ ॥

वाजिनां छन्दोगानां चोद्गीथे प्राणदृष्ट्योपासनं शत्रुपरिभवफलं[1] विहितम्। तत्र विद्यैक्यं पूर्वपक्षी[2] हृदि निधाय [3]राद्धान्तिच्छायया चोदयति—वाजिनां प्राणदृष्ट्योपासनमुद्गीथकर्तृविषयम्, इतरत्र कर्मविषयमिति शब्दादेव प्रतीयते। "अथ हेममासन्यं प्राणमूचुस्त्वं न उद्गायेति। [4]तथेति तेभ्य एष प्राण उदगायत्" इत्यादिनोद्गीथकर्तृविषयं

6. *Anyathātvaṁ s'adāditi cennāvis'eṣāt*

If it be said that there is difference in the *Vidyās* on account of the statements; we say no, on account of non-difference.

The meditation on the *Udgītha* viewed as *Prāna*, is ordained in the text of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* and *Chāndogya Upaniṣads* resulting in the defeat of the enemy. Having retained in the heart, the view *namely*, The *Udgīthavidyās* mentioned in the two *Upaniṣads* are one and the same, the *Pūrvapakṣin* (the objector) puts forth his view as if held by the *Sidhāntin*. The meditation on the *Udgītha* viewed as *Prāna* in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* has as its object that which is the agent in the act of singing it out. In another text (*i.e., Chāndogyopaniṣad*), it has as its object, that which is the object of singing. This has been so understood in the following scriptural texts, 'Then they spoke to *Prāna* of the mouth—Please sing that for us. Saying 'So be it' this *Prāṇa* sang loudly' (*Bṛh.* I-3-7). The statement in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* shows that the *Udgīthavidyā* has as its object that which is the agent

[1] हि added M 1, Pr.
[2] पूर्वपक्षं Pr.
[3] राद्धान्त Pr.
[4] स तथेति A 1, M 2

वाजिनाम्[1] । छन्दोगानां तु—"य एवायं मुख्यः प्राणस्तमुद्गीथमुपासांचक्रिरे[2]" इत्युद्गीथकर्मविषयमिति चेत् । तदिदमाह—अन्यथात्वं शब्दादिति चेदिति । तन्न, उपक्रमाविशेषात् "हन्तासुरान् यज्ञ उद्गीथेनात्ययाम" इत्येकत्र ; अन्यत्रापि "तद्ध देवा उद्गीथमाजहुरनेनैनानभिभविष्यामः[3]" इति ॥

न वा प्रकरणभेदात्परोवरीयस्त्वादिवत् ॥ ७ ॥

नैवम् । प्रकरणं[4] ह्युभयत्र भिद्यते । "ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपा-

in the act of singing it out. The *Udgītha* is considered as having as its object, that which is the object of action of singing and it is so stated in the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* thus—'They meditated upon *Udgītha*, that is viewed as *Prāṇa* of the mouth' (*Chānd.* I-2-7). Thus it is stated in the objection that the *Vidyās* mentioned in the two *Upaniṣads* are quite different from each other The answer is—It is not so; because they have a common beginning. In one text it is stated thus—'Let us overcome the *Asuras* at the sacrifices by means of the *Udgītha*' (*Bṛh.* I-3-1). In another text also this line occurs—'The gods took the *Udgītha*, thinking they would, with that, overcome the *Asuras*' (*Chānd.* I-2-1).

7. *Na vā prakaraṇabhedāt parovarīyastvādivat*

Or on account of the difference of the contexts; as in the case of the attributes of being higher than the high etc.

This is not so. The contexts of the both, are different. In the *Chāndogyopaniṣad*, the *Pranava* which is a part of

[1] उद्गीथकर्तृविषयं वाजिनाम् omitted A 1, M 1.

[2] चक्रुः A 1, M 1. [3] अभिहनिष्यामः M 2, Pr. [4] प्रकरणमपि A 1.

सीत" इत्युद्गीथावयवभूतप्रणवविषयं छन्दोगानाम्। "हन्तासुरान् यज्ञ उद्गीथेनात्ययाम" इति तु वाजिनां कृत्स्नोद्गीथविषयमिति रूपभेदाद्विद्याभेदः; यथैकस्यामपि शाखायामुद्गीथोपासने[1] हिरण्मयपुरुषदृष्टेः परोवरीयस्त्वादिविशिष्टदृष्टिर्भिद्यते ॥

संज्ञातश्चेत्तदुक्तमस्ति तु तदपि ॥ ८ ॥

उद्गीथविद्येति संज्ञैक्याद्विद्यैक्यमुक्तं चेत्, विधेयभेदेऽपि संज्ञैक्यमस्त्येव; यथा नैयमिकाग्निहोत्रे कुण्डपायिनामयनाग्निहोत्रे चेत्येवमादिषु ॥

the *Udgītha* is said to be the object of the meditation in the text—'Let him meditate on the syllable '*Om*' as *Udgītha*' (*Chānd.* I-1-1). *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* begins with the passage, 'Let us overcome the *Asuras* at the sacrifice by means of the *Udgītha*' (*Bṛh.* I-3-1). Here the meditation refers to the whole of the *Udgītha* as the object. Hence these *Vidyās* are considered to be different from each other due the difference in their forms. As regards the meditation on the *Udgītha*, in the text of the same *S'ākhā*, the Highest Self is viewed as of golden colour and He is also viewed differently as possessing the attributes of being higher than the high.

8. *Saṁjñātas'cet taduktamasti tu tadapi*

If it be said so on account of the common term; that also is there.

If the *Vidyās* mentioned in the two texts are held only one, as they possess the common term of *Udgītha*, the common term persists, even where the object of injunction differs. Take for instance the term '*Agnihotra*', which applies to

[1] उपासनं A 1, M 2.

व्याप्तेश्च समञ्जसम् ॥ ९ ॥

प्रथमप्रपाठक उपक्रमवदुत्तरास्वपि प्रणवस्योपास्यत्वव्याप्तेर्मध्ये च "उद्गीथमुपासांचक्रिरे" इति प्रणवविषयत्वमेव समञ्जसम् ॥

सर्वाभेदाधिकरणम् ३

सर्वाभेदादन्यत्रेमे ॥ १० ॥

"यो ह वै ज्येष्ठं च श्रेष्ठं च वेद ज्येष्ठश्च ह वै श्रेष्ठश्च भवति । प्राणो वाव ज्येष्ठश्च श्रेष्ठश्च" इति वाजिनां छन्दोगानां कौषीतकिनां

the permanent *Agnihotra* as well as to the occasional *Agnihotra*, that belongs to the sacrifice, called, 'Kundapāyinām Ayanam' and is to be performed only for a mouth.

9. *Vyāptesca samañjasam*

This is appropriate, on account of extension.

Just as in the beginning of the first chapter of the *Chāndogyopanisad*, in further portions also there is the mention of the *Pranava*. Therefore in the middle also the meditation mentioned in the text—'They meditated upon the *Udgītha*' (*Chānd.* I-2-2) should be the meditation on the *Praṇava*.

SARVĀBHEDĀDHIKARANA 3

10. *Sarvābhedādanyatreme*

Because of the non-difference of everything, these attributes are apprehended even in other places.

'He, who knows the oldest and the best, becomes himself the oldest and the best, The *Prāṇa* is the oldest and best' (*Chānd.* V-1-1; *Bṛh.* VI-1-1 and *Kaus.*). In all these three texts, it is stated unanimously that *Prāṇa* is the oldest;

च प्राणविद्यायां वागादिकरणग्रामस्थितेस्तत्कार्यस्य च प्राणहेतुकत्वेन तिसृष्वप्येकरूपेण प्राणज्यैष्ठ्यमुपपादितम्। वागादिगतवसिष्ठत्वादिसंबन्धित्वमपि प्राणस्योभयत्रोक्तम्। कौषीतकिनां तु तन्नोक्तम्। [1]तथापि सर्वत्र ज्यैष्ठ्योपपादनप्रकारस्य सर्वस्याभेदाद्विद्यैक्यमिति कौषीतकिप्राणविद्यायामपि वसिष्ठत्वादय उपसंहार्याः॥

आनन्दाद्यधिकरणम् ४

आनन्दादयः प्रधानस्य॥ ११॥

अभेदादिति [2]वर्तते। ब्रह्मस्वरूपनिरूपणान्तर्गतामलत्वज्ञानानन्दा-

because it is the cause for the existence of the sense-organs, such as speech, etc, and for their functions. In the two texts, *namely Chāndogya* and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* it is stated that the quality of being the richest is mentioned as belonging to *Prāṇa*, though it really pertains to the speech. But this is not stated in *Kauṣītakī* text However there is no difference between the *Prāṇavidyās* taught in all the three texts, because the *Prāṇa* is said to possess the quality of being the oldest in all these texts with the same reasonings. Therefore the quality of being the richest also must be included in the *Prāṇavidyā* mentioned in the *Kausītakī* text.

ĀNANDĀDYADHIKARAṆA 4

11. *Ānandādayaḥ pradhānasya*

Bliss, etc. have to be included; on account of the non-difference of the chief object

The word ' non-difference ' is supplied from the last *Sūtra*. The attributes, such as stainlessness knowledge and bliss, etc.

[1] अथापि A 1. [2] अनुवर्तते M 1.

दयो गुणाः सर्वासु परविद्यासूपसंहार्याः,[1] गुणिनो ब्रह्मणः सर्वत्राभेदात् ॥

प्रियशिरस्त्वाद्यप्राप्तिः; उपचयापचयौ हि भेदे ॥ १२ ॥

"तस्य प्रियमेव शिरः" इति प्रियशिरस्त्वादीनामप्राप्तिः, ब्रह्मगुणत्वाभावात्तेषाम् । शिरःपक्षादिभेदे ब्रह्मगुणे सति, [2]ब्रह्मण उपचयापचयप्रसक्तिः ॥

इतरे त्वर्थसामान्यात् ॥ १३ ॥

which are among the essential characteristics of the *Brahman* and which help in proving Him, have to be included in all the *Vidyās* relating to the Highest Self. Because the *Brahman* remains as the common object to be meditated in all the Vidyās.

12. *Priyaśirastvādyaprāptiḥ; upacayāpacayau hi bhede*

The qualities, such as, having joy for His head, are not to be included; for if the difference in head, sides etc. accepted as qualifying attributes of the *Brahman*, there would be increase and decrease in the *Brahman*.

Here the qualities, such as, having joy for His head as per the text 'Verily Joy is His head' (*Tait.* III-5-2) are not to be included; because these cannot be the qualities, that could determine the nature of the *Brahman*. Suppose the differences in head, etc. are the attributes of the *Brahman*. Then it happens that there would be the increase and the decrease in the *Brahman*.

13. *Itaretvarthasāmānyat*

But the other qualities have to be included as they are common to the *Brahman*.

[1] उपास्याः A 1. [2] ब्रह्मणि M 1, ब्रह्मोपचया etc. M 3.

आनन्दादयः स्वरूपनिरूपणान्तर्गततया ब्रह्मसमाना इत्युपसंहार्या एव ॥

आध्यानाय प्रयोजनाभावात् ॥ १४ ॥

प्रियशिरस्त्वाद्युपदेशो ब्रह्मणोऽनुचिन्तनार्थः, प्रयोजनान्तराभावात् ॥

आत्मशब्दाच्च ॥ १५ ॥

"अन्योऽन्तर आत्मानन्दमयः" इत्यात्मशब्दाच्च शिरःपक्षादयो न ब्रह्मगुणाः ॥

Here the conclusion arrived at is this—Bliss, etc. are included in those qualities, that help in proving and specifying the *Brahman*. Hence they are common with the *Brahman*.

14. *Ādhyānāya prayojanābhāvāt*

Those qualities are intended for meditation; on account of the absence of any other purpose.

The teachings, such as, 'having joy for His head' are intended for meditation only, because there is no any other purpose for them.

15. *Ātmaśabdācca*

And on account of the use of the term Ātman in the scriptural texts.

The word, Ātman (Self) occurs in the scriptural text, 'There is the Inner Self who is different and full of Bliss' (*Tait.* I, II-5-2). Therefore the head, sides etc. are not the essential qualities of the *Brahman*.

आत्मगृहीतिरितरवदुत्तरात् ॥ १६ ॥

परमात्मन एवात्मशब्देन ग्रहणमिति "सोऽकामयत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इत्युत्तरात् बहुभवनसंकल्पाभिधायिनो वाक्यादवगम्यते ; "आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्" इत्यात्मशब्दवत्[1] ॥

अन्वयादिति चेत्, स्यादवधारणात् ॥ १७ ॥

पूर्वत्र प्राणमयादिष्वात्मशब्दान्वयात् कथमुत्तरान्निर्णय इति चेत्,

16. *Ātmagṛhītiritaravaduttarāt*

The Highest Self is referred to by the term Ātman as in other places; on account of the subsequent reference.

By the word, 'Self' is apprehended the Highest Self. This is understood in this way, because there are subsequent passages, such as, 'It thought. Let me become many' (*Tait.* I, II-6-2) that reveal the Lord's will to become many. It is like in the case of the word Ātman (Self) found in the text 'This world was before, only one Ātman' (Self)

17. *Anvyāditi cet syādavadhāraṇāt*

If it be said, the word, Ātman (Self) is used in connection with other objects also, we say, it is determined that He alone is referred to in other contexts also.

The word, Ātman (Self) used in the preceding occasions, refers to *Prāṇamaya*. How then can it be determined that He is meant there, with the help of the subsequent passage?

[1] शब्दादिवत् A 1, M 2, Pr,

यानामपां प्राणवासस्त्वानुसंधानमप्राप्तं विधीयत इति युक्तम् । अप्राप्तस्यैव विधेयतया ख्यापनादत्रानुवादस्वरूपो[1] विधिः कल्प्यत इत्यर्थः ॥

समानाधिकरणम् ६

समान एवं चाभेदात् ॥ १९ ॥

अग्निरहस्ये बृहदारण्यके चाम्नाता शाण्डिल्यविद्या । एकत्र "स आत्मानमुपासीत मनोमयं प्राणशरीरं भारूपं सत्यसंकल्पमाकाशात्मानम्" इति । इतरत्र "मनोमयोऽयं पुरुषो भाः सत्यं तस्मिन्नन्तर्हृदये यथा व्रीहिर्वा

the dress for *Prāṇa* is enjoined; because this is not established otherwise. *Ācamana* of water could not be enjoined because it is already established by good custom; but it is mentioned for enjoining the dress of *Prāṇa*. It is an accepted rules that that alone should be enjoined which is not established otherwise.

SAMĀNĀDHIKARAṆA 6

19. *Samāna evaṁ cābhedāt*

When some thing is common, there is no difference in other qualities also.

In the *Agnirahasya*, and the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* there are statements on the *S'āndilyavidyā*. In one text it is stated thus—'He should meditate on the Self, who is conceivable in *mind*, who is in the form of *Prāna* and light, who has a true will and who is in the form of the spatial ether' (*Vāja. S'at. P. Br.* 10-4-6-2). In the other text (*Bṛhadāranyakopanisad*) it is stated thus—'This person who is conceivable in the *mind* is in the form of light and truth, shines forth in the

[1] अनुवादस्वरूपः M 2.

यवो वा स एष सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः सर्वस्याधिपतिः सर्वमिदं प्रशास्ति" इति। उभयत्र मनोमयत्वादिके समाने सति वशित्वादेः सत्यसंकल्पत्वविततिरूपेणाभेदाद्विद्यैक्यम्[1] ॥

संबन्धाधिकरणम् ७

संबन्धादेवमन्यत्रापि ॥ २० ॥

"य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डले पुरुषो यश्चायं दक्षिणेऽक्षन्" इत्युपक्रम्य सत्यस्य ब्रह्मण आदित्यमण्डलेऽक्षिणि चोपास्यत्वमुक्त्वा "तस्योपनिषद्-

interior of the heart, like the grain of rice and the grain of wheat. He is the Controller of all. He is the Lord of all. He is the Chief of all. He rules everything' (*Bṛh.* V-6-1). In both the texts, He is mentioned as *Manomaya* (conceivable in mind). Hence the statement of His controllership, does not contradict the statement of His possession of true will which is the expansion of the former. Therefore the *S'āṇḍilya-vidyā* of the two texts is one and the same, as there is no difference in their characteristics.

SAMBANDHĀDHIKARANA 7

20. *Sambandhādevamanyatrāpi*

On account of the connection (of the same in both) the qualities are common to both.

The passage begins with, 'This person, who is seen inside the orb of the sun and also within the right eye' (B*ṛh.* V-5-2). Then the passage states that the true *Brahman* is to be meditated upon as present in the orb of the sun and in the right eye. Then two secret names of the *Brahman* are mentioned in the scriptural texts, 'His secret name is *Ahar*,

[1] ऐक्यम् M 1, Pr.

हरित्यधिदैवतम्" "तस्योपनिषदहमित्यध्यात्मम्" इति द्वे रहस्यनामन्याम्नायेते । उभयत्रैकस्यैवोपास्यस्य संबन्धाद्विद्यैक्यमित्युभयत्रोभे नामनी ॥

न वा विशेषात् ॥ २१ ॥

नैतत्; आदित्याक्षिस्थानसंबन्धभेदादुपास्यस्य, विद्याभेद इति तत्र[1] नियते नामनी ॥

दर्शयति च ॥ २२ ॥

दर्शयति च श्रुतिर्विद्याभेदं "तस्यैतस्य तदेव रूपं यदमुष्य रूपम्" इति रूपातिदेशं ब्रुवती ॥

He is above all gods.' (*Bṛh.* V-5-3). 'His secret name is *Aham,* He is above all selves' (*Bṛh.* V-5-4). In both the texts, is mentioned only one object, to be meditated upon. Therefore the two texts mention the same *Vidyā* and both the names have to be meditated upon.

21. *Na vā vis'eṣāt*

This is not so; on account of the difference.

This is not correct. The *Vidyās* are different; because there is difference in the places with which the *Brahman* is said to be connected, the places being the orb of the sun and the right eye. Therefore each name is restricted in regard to each place.

22. *Dars'ayati ca*

The text also declares this.

The *Vidyās* mentioned in the two texts are distinct from each other. This is because the text 'His form mentioned

[1] तत्र omitted A 1.

संभृत्यधिकरणम् ८

संभृतिद्युव्याप्त्यपि चातः ॥ २३ ॥

"ब्रह्म ज्येष्ठा वीर्या संभृतानि । ब्रह्माग्रे ज्येष्ठं दिवमाततान" इत्यादि ज्येष्ठानां वीर्याणां ब्रह्मणि संभृतिर्द्युव्याप्तिश्च ब्रह्मण इत्येतदनारभ्याधीतमपि न सर्वोपासनशेषभूतम् । अतो द्युव्याप्तिः सामर्थ्यादल्पस्थानव्यतिरिक्तेषूपासनेषु प्राप्नोति । संभृत्याद्यपि द्युव्याप्तिसहपठितं तत्रैव ॥

here is the same as that mentioned in the other context' (*Chānd.* I 7-5), mentions the application of the form described in one place, to the other place also.

SAMBHṚTYADHIKARANA 8

23. *Saṁbhṛtidyuvyāptyapi cātaḥ*

And for the same reason the two virtues *namely* the holding together the powers and pervading the spatial ether, do not apply to all *Vidyās.*

'Gathered together are these greatest powers, in the *Brahman.* The Greatest *Brahman* in the beginning pervaded the sky (*Tait. Br.* II-4-7-10). In the Greatest *Brahman* are seen together all these powers. The *Brahman* pervaded the sky. These attributes are not stated with reference to any special meditation. However they cannot be included in all meditations. Therefore the quality of pervading the sky is connected with such meditation in which the place other than small is mentioned. In this text His holding of the powers is mentioned along with the pervasion of the spatial ether. Hence this quality also is applicable only in that case.

पुरुषविद्याधिकरणम् ९

पुरुषविद्यायामपि चेतरेषामनाम्नानात् ॥ २४ ॥

छान्दोग्ये तैत्तिरीयके चाम्नाता पुरुषविद्या भिन्ना; यजमानपत्न्यादीनां यज्ञावयवानामितरेषां सवनत्रयादीनां चैकत्राम्नातानामन्यत्रानाम्नानात्, फलभेदाच्च। तैत्तिरीयक आत्मादीनां यजमानत्वादिकल्पनम्[1]। [2]सायंप्रातर्मध्यंदिनानां [3]सवनत्रयत्वकल्पनम्। ब्रह्ममहिमप्राप्तिः फलम्। [4]अत्र

PURUṢAVIDYĀDHIKARAṆA 9

24. *Puruṣavidyāyāmapi cetareṣāmanāmnānāt*

There is difference among the *Puruṣavidyās* also; because what is stated in one, is not stated in the other.

The *Purusavidyās* described in the *Taittirīyaka* and the *Chāndogya Upaniṣads* are different from each other. In one of them are stated the agent of the sacrifice and his wife as the limbs of the sacrifice and the three libations. These have not been recorded in the other text. There is also difference in respect of the fruits. In the *Taittirīyaka* text the self of the meditator is mentioned as *Yajamāna* (the agent of the sacrifice). The evenings, mornings and middays are mentioned as the three *Savanas* (libations). The fruit is the attainment of the greatness of the *Brahman*. In this

[1] आदि omitted M 1, Pr. [2] सायंप्रातर्मध्यंदिनसवनत्वकल्पनं A 1.

[3] सवनत्वकल्पनं A 1, M 1, Pr.

[4] अत्रेत्थं श्रीभाष्यश्रुतप्रकाशिका—"कथं फलाश्रवणम्? पुरुषविद्याया उपरिष्टात् 'ब्रह्मणो महिमानमाप्नोति' इति हि फलं श्रूयते। तन्न। केवलपुरुषविद्याया ब्रह्मविद्यात्वाभावात् ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरूप फलमयोग्यत्वात् पुरुषविद्यासबन्धमनवाप्य पूर्वानुवाकोक्तब्रह्मविद्यान्वितं भवति। यथा द्वादशाहीनस्येति वाक्यं सत्रप्रकरणेऽधीतमपि तत्र संबन्धुमयोग्यत्वात् तत उत्कृष्याहीनप्रकरणे संबध्यते तद्वत्।" इति।

फलस्याश्रवणात् पूर्वप्रस्तुतफलब्रह्मविद्याङ्गम् । छान्दोग्ये चाशिशिषादीनां दीक्षादित्वकल्पनम्[1] । त्रेधा विभक्तपुरुषायुषस्य च सवनत्रयत्वकल्पनम्[2] । "वर्षशतं जीवति" इति च फलम् ॥

वेधाद्यधिकरणम् १०

वेधाद्यर्थभेदात् ॥ २५ ॥

उपनिषदारम्भेष्वधीत "शुक्रं प्रविध्य हृदयं प्रविध्य" इत्यादिमन्त्रवत् महाव्रतादिमन्त्रवच्च "शं नो मित्रः" "सह नाववतु" इति मन्त्रा-

text the fruit is not mentioned and hence this *Puruṣavidyā* is held as *Aṅgavidyā* (subordinate One) to the *Brahmavidyā* which is mentioned together with the fruit in the previous portion. In the *Chāndogya* text it is stated thus—The hunger etc. are *Dīkṣā* (consecration). The life divided into three parts assumes the forms of the three *Savanas* (libations). The fruit is stated 'He lives for hundred years' (*Chānd.* III-16-7).

VEDHĀDYADHIKARANA 10

25. *Vedhādyarthabhedāt*

On account of the difference of purpose, such as piercing etc.

In the beginning of the *Upaniṣad* (of the *Ātharvanikas*) are recited the *Mantras* 'pierce the *S'ukra*, pierce the heart'. In the beginning of the *Upaniṣad* (of the *Aitareyins*) are recited the *Mantras* dealing with the *Mahāvrata*. Similarly the *Mantras* recited by the *Taittirīyakas*—'May Mitra be propitious to us' (*Tait.* I-1-1). 'May He protect us together' (*Tait*

[1] दीक्षात्वकल्पनं Pr. [2] पुरुषायुषसवनत्रयकल्पनं A 1.

वपि मन्त्रसामर्थ्येन प्रयोजनभेदावगमादध्ययनशेषभूताविति न विद्याङ्गभूतौ ॥

हान्यधिकरणम् ११

हानौ तूपायनशब्दशेषत्वात् कुशाच्छन्दःस्तुत्युपगानवत्तदुक्तम् ॥ २६ ॥

विदुषो ब्रह्म प्राप्नुवतः[1] पुण्यपापयोर्विमोचनमेकस्यां शाखायां विदुषस्तच्चिन्तनार्थमधीतम् । विमुक्तयोः प्रवेशस्थानमेकस्यां शाखायां पुण्यस्य प्रवेशस्थानं सुहृदो दुष्कृतस्य शत्रव इति । एकस्यां शाखायां विमोचनं प्रवेशस्थानं चेत्युभयमाम्नातम् । सर्वं तच्चिन्तनार्थम् । हानाविति प्रदर्श-

I-2-1). These *Mantras* of the *Taittirīyakas* have certain power and lead to different results. Thus they form parts of the study of the *Vedas*. They are not parts of the *Vidyā*.

26. *Hānan tūpāyanas'abdas'eṣatvāt kus'ācchandaḥ-stutyupagānavat tāduktam*

The statement of getting rid of something has another supplementary statement regarding its reaching another, as in the case of Kus'as, metres, praise and singing. This has been stated.

In one *S'ākhā* it is stated that the wise, who attain the *Brahman*, get rid of the *Punya* and *Pāpa*. This is said to be meditated upon. In another *S'ākhā* are mentioned the places of entry of them. The *Puṇyakarmans* attach themselves to his friends and *Pāpakarmans* enter his enemies. In one *S'ākhā* are mentioned both the release from them and the places of entry of them. All these are

[1] प्राप्तवतः A 1.

नार्थम्, हानावुपायने चेत्यर्थः । हानिर्विमोचनम् । उपायनं [1]प्रवेशः । केवलहानावाम्नातायां केवले चोपायन आम्नाते, इतरेतरसमुच्चयो न्याय्यः । न विकल्पः, उपायनशब्दस्य हानिवाक्यशेषत्वात् । तच्छेषत्वं च त्यक्तयोः प्रवेशस्थानवाचित्वेन[2] तदपेक्षत्वात् । यथा "वानस्पत्याः कुशाः" इत्येतद्वाक्यशेषभूतम् "औदुम्बर्यः कुशाः" इति तद्विशेषकं प्रदेशान्तरस्थम्; यथा च "देवासुराणां छन्दोभिः" इत्येतद्वाक्यशेषभूतम् "देवच्छन्दांसि पूर्वम्" इति प्रदेशान्तरस्थम्; यथा च "हिरण्येन[3] षोडशिनः स्तोत्रमुपाकरोति" इत्येतद्वाक्यशेषभूतम्[4] "समयाविषिते सूर्ये षोडशिनः स्तोत्रम्"

intended for the meditation by the wise. The statement getting rid of them means both the getting rid of them and also their reaching other places. The word, 'getting rid of' means 'leaving' and the word, 'reaching' means 'entry'. It is right to hold that when the leaving alone or the entry alone is mentioned, both of them are intended. It is not right to hold the alternative course of them. The statement of the entry is only supplement to what is stated in the words 'getting rid of'. This is because it declares the places to which the good and evil works, got rid of by the wise, are transferred. Hence it follows that one should be the supplement to the other. In one place this statement occurs—'The *Kus'as* relating to the tree'. This is supplemented by another statement occurring in a different place, *namely*, 'The *Kus'ās* relating to the *Udambara* tree'. The statement, 'The metres of the gods and *Asuras*' has the supplementary text, 'The metres of the gods are prior.' The clause, 'He begins with gold the *Stotra* of the *Sodas'in*'

[1] प्रवेशनम् M 2, Pr. [2] वाचकत्वेन M 2.

[3] हिरण्येन omitted M 2, 3. [4] वाक्य omitted, M 2.

इति; यथा च "ऋत्विज उपगायन्ति" इत्येतच्छेषभूतम् "नाध्वर्युरुपगायेत्" इति। एवमुपायनवाक्यस्य हानिवाक्यशेषतया संभवन्त्यां गतौ न विकल्पो न्याय्यः। तदुक्तम्—"अपितु वाक्यशेषः स्यादन्याय्यत्वाद्विकल्पस्य" इत्यादिना ॥

सांपरायाधिकरणम् १२

सांपराये तर्तव्याभावात्; तथा ह्यन्ये ॥ २७ ॥

सुकृतदुष्कृतयोर्हानिः "अश्व इव रोमाणि विधूय पापं धूत्वा शरीरम्" इति देहवियोगकाले श्रुता। शाखान्तरे—"स आगच्छति विरजां नदीं

has for its supplementary clause, 'He begins the *stotra* of the *Sodas'in*, when the sun has half risen' (*Tait. Sam* VI-6-11). The statement, 'All the priests join in the singing' has for its supplementary statement, 'The *Adhvaryu* priest does not sing.' (*Tait. Sam.* VI-3-1). Thus the statement as regards the getting rid of has the supplementary statement of reaching. Therefore it is proper that the alternative course should not arise here when the other one is available. Therefore it is stated thus—'One statement will supplement another as the alternative course is not proper' (*Pūr. Mī.* X-8-15).

SĀMPARĀYĀDHIKARAṆA 12

27. *Sāmparāye tartavyābhāvāt; tathāhyanye*

At death the *Puṇya* and *Pāpa Karmans* leave the person: because there is nothing to be enjoyed thereafter. For, thus certain texts declare.

That there will be getting rid of the good and bad deeds at the time of death is stated in the text, 'Shaking off the sins as a horse his hairs, and shaking off the body' (*Chānd.* VIII-13-1). In a different *S'ākhā*, the giving up of the good and the bad deeds on the way has been stated thus, 'The self

तत्सुकृतदुष्कृते धूनुते" [1]इत्यध्वन्यपि श्रुतापि सांपराये चरमदेहवियोगकाल एव चिन्तनीया, देहवियोगादूर्ध्वं ब्रह्मप्राप्तिव्यतिरेकेण तरितव्यभोगाभावात्। तथा ह्यन्ये शाखिनः "तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये" इति देहवियोगसमनन्तरं ब्रह्मप्राप्तिमधीयते ॥

छन्दत उभयाविरोधात् ॥ २८ ॥

देहवियोगकाले पुण्यपापविमोचनश्रुतेर्देहवियोगादूर्ध्वं ब्रह्मप्राप्तिश्रुतेश्चेत्युभयश्रुत्यविरोधाद्धेतोः "सुकृतदुष्कृते धूनुते" इत्ययं श्रुतिखण्ड-

reaches the river *Virajā* and shakes off his good and bad deeds' (*Kaus.* I-37). Though it has been stated so differently, it should be meditated upon only at the time of death. After the separation from the body, the self ought not to enjoy pleasure or pain, without attaining the *Brahman*. Accordingly in another *S'ākhā* it is stated that the self reaches the *Brahman* immediately after the death. The relevant passage is this—'For him there is delay only so long as he is not freed from the body; then he will reach the *Brahman*' (*Chānd.* VI-14-2).

28. *Chandata Ubhayāvirodhāt*

As it is desired; on account of there being no contradiction of either.

There are scriptural statements to prove that the good and evil deeds leave the self at the time of death. There are also statements to show that the *Brahman* ought to be attained immediately after death. There should be no contradiction between these two statements. Therefore the scriptural statement, 'He gives up good and evil deeds' (*Kauṣ.* I-37) has

[1] इत्यन्यथापि M 2.

श्छन्दतो नेतव्यः; "एतं देवयानं पन्थानमापद्य[1]" इति वाक्यखण्डात् प्रागनुगमयितव्य इत्यर्थः ॥

चोदयति—

गतेरर्थवत्त्वमुभयथा; अन्यथा हि विरोधः ॥ २९ ॥

देवयानगतिश्रुतेरर्थवत्त्वमुभयत्र चिन्तायामेव । [2]अन्यथा देहवियोगकाल एव चिन्तायां तस्मिन्नेव सर्वकर्मक्षयात् देहाभावेन गतिर्नोपपद्यत इति हि गतिश्रुतिविरोधः ॥

to be considered so as to suit the convenience. This means that this passage must be taken as coming before the earlier passage 'Having reached that path of the gods' (*Kauṣ.* I-21).

Then the following objection is put—

29. *Gaterarthavatvamubhayathā; anyathā hi virodah*

There is a meaning in the soul's going, only on the two-fold hypothesis; for otherwise there is contradiction.

The scriptural text referring to the journey through the path of gods, will be sensible only when the leaving of the deeds is accepted to take place on two different occasions. Otherwise if it is considered to take place at the time of death, then all his deeds must perish at that time. Then as he has no body, he cannot proceed by any path. Hence there will be contradiction regarding the journey, as stated in the scriptural texts.

[1] अभिप्रपद्य M 2, 3. [2] अन्यत्र M 2.

परिहरति—

उपपन्नस्तल्लक्षणार्थोपलब्धेर्लोकवत् ॥ ३० ॥

देहवियोगकाले सर्वकर्मक्षयेऽपि गतिविधिरुपपन्नः, ब्रह्मोपासीनानामकर्मलभ्यार्थोपलब्धेः "स स्वराड् भवति तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति" इत्यादौ; यथा लोके राजानमुपासीनानामितरपुरुषासाधारणसर्वार्थसिद्धिः ॥

यावदधिकारमवस्थितिराधिकारिकाणाम् ॥ ३१ ॥

This objection is refuted thus—

30. *Upapannastallakṣaṇārthopalabdherlokavat*

That assumption is justified; on account of perception of the things, that are caused by that. This is as in ordinary experience.

At the time of the separation from the body, all his deeds become destroyed. Yet it is possible for him to proceed through the path; because those, who meditate upon the *Brahman*, can achieve their objects even without deeds, as stated in the scriptural text. 'He becomes a self-ruler, he moves about in all worlds according to his will' (*Chānd.* VII-25-2). This is just as in the world, those, who serve the kings obtain all their desires, that could not be got by other persons.

31. *Yāvadadhikāramavasthitirādhikārikāṇām*

Of those, who are entrusted with certain office, there is subsistence of their *Karmans*, as long as they are in that office.

वसिष्ठादीनां ज्ञानिनामपि देहपातादूर्ध्वं फलान्तरानुभवः, प्रारब्धाधिकारहेतुकर्मविनाशाभावात् । यावदधिकारसमाप्ति तद्धेतुकर्मफलानुभवाय तेषां तत्रैव स्थितिः, नार्चिरादिप्राप्तिः । ज्ञानिनामपि प्रारब्धकर्मानुभवेनैव नश्यतीति वक्ष्यते[1] ॥

अनियमाधिकरणम् १३

अनियमः सर्वेषामविरोधः शब्दानुमानाभ्याम् ॥ ३२ ॥

येषूपकोसलादिषूपासनेष्वर्चिरादिगतिराम्नाता, तन्निष्ठानामेव तया प्राप्तिरिति तच्चिन्तनमपि तेषामेवेति नियमाभावः; अपितु सर्वोपासन-

Even the wise sages, *Vasiṣṭha* and others, enjoy the various fruits of their works, after giving up the body ; because the *Karmans*, that lead to their holding a particular office, are not destroyed. As long as their office lasts, they remain there in order to enjoy the fruits of their deeds. They do not proceed by the path of light, etc. It will be stated that even of those who obtained the knowledge of *Brahman*, the deeds which actually began to yield the fruits, will perish only after their fruits have been fully enjoyed.

ANIYAMADHIKARAṆA 13

32. *Aniyamaḥ sarveṣāmavirodhaḥ sabdānumānābhyām*

There is no restriction, in regard to the path since all have to go on that. Thus there is non-contradiction of scriptural texts and *Smṛtis*.

In the texts dealing with the meditations such as *Upakosala*, it has been stated that those who meditate upon the *Brahman* as stated therein, proceed along the path of light, etc.

[1] वक्ष्यति A 1.

निष्ठानाम् । तथा सत्येव श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यामविरोधः । श्रुतिस्तावत् पञ्चाग्निविद्यायाम् "ये चामी अरण्ये श्रद्धां सत्यमुपासते तेऽर्चिषमभिसंभवन्ति" इत्यविशेषेण श्रुता । स्मृतिरपि "अग्निर्ज्योतिरहः शुक्लः" इत्यादिका ॥

अक्षरध्यधिकरणम् १४

अक्षरधियां त्ववरोधः सामान्यतद्भावाभ्यामौपसदवत्तदुक्तम् ॥ ३३ ॥

But there is no restriction that those alone who meditate upon the *Brahman* as stated in those *Vidyās* attain the *Brahman* by that path and hence they alone should meditate on that path. But all the meditators engaged in various *Vidyās* also attain the *Brahman*, and go by that path. Then only the contradiction between the teachings of the scriptures and the *Smṛtis* can be averted. The scriptural text mentioned in the *Pañcāgnividyā* (*i.e.*, the meditation on the five fires) is this—'Those, who in the forest meditate on faith and truth, they reach the path of light'. (*Bṛh.* VI-2-15). *Smṛti* text is this—'Fire, light, day, the bright-fortnight etc.' (*Bhag. Gī.* VIII-24).

AKSARADHYADHIKARANA 14

33. *Akṣaradhiyāṁ tvavarodhaḥ sāmānyatadbhāvābhyāmaupasadavattaduktam*

The conceptions of the Imperishable, have to be included in all the meditations; on account of the sameness of the object of meditation and of the possibility of the meditation, as in the case of those belonging to the *Upasad.* This has been thus stated

"एतद्वै तदक्षरम्" "अथ परा यया तदक्षरम्" इत्यारभ्य "अस्थूलमनण्वह्रस्वमदीर्घमलोहितम्" "यत्तदद्रेश्यमग्राह्यम्" [1]इत्याद्यस्थूलत्वाद्रेश्यत्वादिविषयाणामक्षरब्रह्मसंबन्धिनीना[2] धियां सर्वासु परविद्यासु संग्रहः, गुणिनो ब्रह्मणः सर्वत्रैकत्वात्; एतैर्गुणैर्विना सकलेतरव्यावृत्तब्रह्मानुसंधानानुपपत्तेश्च। हेयसंबन्धानर्हानन्दादयो हि[3] प्रत्यगात्मनो ब्रह्मव्यावर्तकाः। प्रधानानुवर्तित्वं हि गुणस्वभावः। यथा जामदग्न्यचतूरात्रपुरोडाशोपसद्गुणभूतमन्त्रस्य प्रधानभूतोपसदनुवर्तित्वेनोपांशुगुणकत्वम्। तदुक्तम् "गुणमुख्यव्यतिक्रमे" इत्यादिना॥

The scriptural texts begin with, 'This is indeed Imperishable' (*Bṛh.* III-8-8), 'Then the higher knowledge is that whereby that Imperishable is apprehended' (*Mund.* I-1-5) and end respectively with, 'It is neither gross nor minute, neither short nor long, it is not red' (*Bṛh.* III-8-8), 'That which is not visible and not knowable' (*Muṇd.* I-1-6). Here in the *Paravidyās* (the higher meditations) all the attributes of the Imperishable *Brahman* (such as), neither gross nor visible etc. have to be included; because the *Brahman*, the possessor of these attributes, is apprehended to be a single object. And because without these attributes, it is not possible to meditate upon Him, as distinct from all other objects. The characteristics that distinguish the *Brahman* from the individual souls, are the bliss etc. that do not tolerate the connection with evils. Indeed it is natural that the *Gunas* (subordinates) are in harmony with the *Pradhāna* (principal). Consider the following for instance—The *Mantra* that stands in a subordinate relation to the *Upasad* offerings in the Caturātra (the four days' function)

[1] इत्याद्यस्थूलत्वादृश्यत्वादि A 1, M 1. [2] ब्रह्म omitted A 1, M 1.
[3] अपि for हि M 2, Pr.

नैतावता सर्वत्र सर्वोपसंहारप्राप्तिरित्याह[1]—

इयदामननात् ॥ ३४ ॥

आमननम्; आभिमुख्येन मननम्। इयदेव गुणजातं सर्वत्रोपसंहार्यं, येन गुणजातेन सकलेतरव्यावृत्तब्रह्ममननम् ॥

अन्तरत्वाधिकरणम् १५

अन्तरा भूतग्रामवत्स्वात्मनोऽन्यथा भेदानुपपत्तिरिति चेन्नोपदेशवत् ॥ ३५ ॥

of the Jāmadagnya sacrifice, is recited in a low voice (Upāms'u) according to the rules prescribed for the *Mantras* of Yajurveda to which the principal thing *Upasad* belongs. This principle has been explained in the *Pūr. Mīm. Sū.*, III-3-9.

That following this argument, it could not be objected that all the attributes stated in different *Vidyās*, have to be included in all the *Vidyās*, is proved in the following *Sūtra*—

34. *Iyadāmananāt*

Only so much qualities have to be included for the sake of meditation.

The word '*Āmanana*' means 'the consecrated meditation.' Only so much of the qualities have to be included in all meditations, as are useful in distinguishing the *Brahman* from other objects.

ANTARATVĀDHIKARAṆA 15

35. *Antarā Bhūtagrāmavatsvatmanonyathā bhedānupapattiriti cennopades'avat*

Should it be said that the enquiry about the inner

[1] व्याप्तिरित्याह Pr.

"य आत्मा" इत्युषस्तप्रश्नो भूतग्रामवत्प्रत्यगात्मविषयः । अन्यथा "यः प्राणेन प्राणिति स त आत्मा" इति प्रतिवचनस्य कहोलप्रश्नप्रतिवचनविषयादशनायाद्यतीतत्वादेर्भेदानुपपत्तिरिति चेत्; न, "य आत्मा सर्वान्तरः" इत्युभयत्र प्रश्नैकरूप्यात् परमात्मैवोभयत्र विषयः । प्रतिवचनगतप्राणनादिहेतुत्वमशनायाद्यतीतत्वं च परमात्मन्येवोपपद्यते । प्राणनादिहेतुत्वं हि परमात्मन एव, "को ह्येवान्यात्कः प्राण्यात्" इत्यादिश्रुतेः । सद्विद्योपदेशवत् प्रश्नप्रतिवचनावृत्तिरेकविषया ॥

self, refers to that self to whom the aggregate form of material things belongs; since otherwise the difference of the two replies could not be accounted for, we say —no; as in the case of the instruction

The question put by *Usasta* about the self (in *Bṛh.* III-4-1) refers to the individual self to whom the aggregate form of material things belongs. Otherwise the object mentioned in the reply 'The self is he, who breathes through the vital wind (*i.e.*, *Prāna*)' could not be differentiated from the one, mentioned in the reply given to the question of Kahola, as freed from hunger thirst etc. It is not so. In both the places the questions are in only one form, *namely*, 'The Self, who is the inner self of all' (*Bṛh.*III-4-1). Hence in both the places the Highest Self is referred to. Causing the breath and the absence of thirst and hunger mentioned in the reply could be justified only in the Highest self. That the Highest self is the cause of breathing, has been mentioned in the text, 'who could breathe and live if there were not this blissful Ākāsa (*Brahman*)?' (*Tait.* I-2-7). As in the case of the *Sadvidyā*, the repeated questions and answers refer to the same object (*Brahman*),

प्रष्टृभेदोऽपि न भेदक इत्याह—

व्यतिहारो विंशिषन्ति हीतरवत् ॥ ३६ ॥

अर्थैक्ये निश्चिते सति प्रष्ट्रोर्बुद्धिव्यतिहारः कार्यः। उषस्तेनाशनायाद्यतीतत्वधीः कार्या[1]। कहोलेनापि प्राणनादिहेतुत्वधीः कार्या। [2]उभयप्रकरणगतवाक्यानि हि परमात्मानमेव विशिषन्ति, यथेतरत्र सद्विद्यायाम्[3] ॥

सद्विद्यायामपि प्रश्नाद्यावृत्तौ कथमैक्यमित्यत्राह—

Though there is a difference of persons putting the questions, yet that will not cause the difference in the *Vidyā*. This fact is explained in the next *Sūtra*—

36. *Vyatihāro viśiṁṣanti hītaravat*

There is the combination of ideas; for the attributes specify the same object, as in other cases.

When the subject matter is decided to be same, there should be the combination of ideas of those who put the questions. The combination should be thus—*Uṣasta* should know Him, also as free from hunger and thirst; *Kahola* also should bear the idea, that He causes the breath etc. because these two statements distinguish the Highest self. The same is the case in another context, *namely*, *sadvidyā* also.

How is it that the same thing is meant in the *Sadvidyā*, even there is the repetition in question etc.? The reply is this—

[1] कार्या omitted M 1. [2] उभयत्र M 1, Pr.

[3] सद्विद्यायाम् omitted M 1, Pr.

सैव हि सत्यादयः ॥ ३७ ॥

"सेयं देवतैक्षत" इति प्रस्तुता देवतैव सर्वत्र प्रश्नगता। प्रतिवचनेषु च "तत्सत्यं स आत्मा" इत्यादय इत्यैक्यम् ॥

कामाद्याधिकरणम् १६

कामादीतरत्र तत्र चायतनादिभ्यः ॥ ३८ ॥

"दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तर आकाशस्तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यम्" इत्युक्त्वा "एष आत्मापहतपाप्मा" इत्यारभ्य "सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पः" इति छान्दोग्ये। वाजिना च "य एषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशस्तस्मिञ्छेते सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः" इति। उभयत्र हृदयायतनत्वसत्यसंकल्पत्वतद्विशेषरूप-

37. *Saiva hi satyādayaḥ*

Indeed the same Highest God and The Truth etc.

The questions asked in different contexts are about the same Divinity mentioned in the text—'This Divinity thought' (*Chānd.* VI-3-1). The replies also mean the same thing, *namely*, 'That is Reality. That is the Self etc' (*Chānd.* VI-8-7).

KĀMĀDYADHIKARANA 16

38. *Kāmādītaratra tatra cāyatanādibhyaḥ*

Desire, etc. are common here and there, as known from the abode etc.

In the *Chāṇdoyopanṣiad* occur the following passages:—'In it there is the subtle Ākāśa (*Brahman*) This and what is within that, both should be meditated upon. (*Chānd.* VIII-1-1). 'This is the Self devoid of evils' (*Chānd.* VIII-1-5). 'With true desire and true will' (*Chānd.* VIII-1-5). In the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* it is stated thus—'In the space within the

वशित्वादिभिर्दहरविद्याप्रत्यभिज्ञानात् [1]सत्यसंकल्पत्वसहचारिणोऽपहतपाप्म-त्वादिसत्यकामत्वपर्यन्ता[2] उभयत्रोपसंहार्याः ॥

आदरादलोपः ॥ ३९ ॥

"नेह नानास्ति किंचन" "स एष नेति नेत्यात्मा" इति निषेधो न वशित्वादिगुणविषयः, "सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः" इति तेषामज्ञातानामादरेण विधानात् । अतो न लोपः । सर्वस्य ब्रह्मकार्य-

heart lies the Ruler of all and the Lord of all' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-22). In both these texts, it is stated that He has heart as His abode, He has true will and He is the controller of all. These references indicate that the *Daharavidyā* is meant in both the contexts. Therefore the qualities, beginning with being devoid of evil and ending with the possession of true desire along with the possession of true will have to be included in both the contexts.

39. *Ādarādalopah*

On account of the purposeful statement, there cannot be omission.

'There is not any diversity here' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-19). 'He is the Self, said 'not this, not this' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-22). These negative statements do not negate the attributes, *namely*, being the controller of all etc, because they are purposely taught in the following text, as they are not otherwise known. 'He is the controller of all, He is the Lord of all' (*Bṛh.* IV-14-22). Hence there could not be any omission.

[1] सत्यसंकल्पत्वसहचारेण M 1. [2] सत्यसंकल्पत्वपर्यन्ताः M 2, Pr.

तयैक्यात् "नेह नानास्ति" इत्यब्रह्मात्मकनानात्वं प्रतिषिध्यते । "स एष नेति नेत्यात्मा" [1]इति च प्राकृतविशेषविषयम् ॥

उपस्थितेऽतस्तद्वचनात् ॥ ४० ॥

उपस्थिते; ब्रह्मोपसंपन्ने । अतः; उपसंपत्तेरेव हेतोः । "जक्षत्क्रीडन् रममाणः" इत्यादिना छन्दतो ज्ञात्यादिप्राप्त्यभिधानात् साक्षान्मोक्षफलं तत्, न सांसारिकफलमिति परविद्यैवैषा सगुणा ॥

All these worlds are one with the *Brahman*, as they are the production of him. The statement, *namely*, 'There is not any diversity here' means to deny the existence of the things separately without having the *Brahman* as their Self. The clause, 'not so, not so' declares that the *Brahman* is not of material nature.

40. *Upasthitetastadvacanāt*

The self, who has reached the *Brahman*, on the very same account (moves about in all the worlds as he likes); for it is so declared by the text.

The word, *Upasthita*, means, 'one who has reached the *Brahman*' The word '*Atah*' means 'on the very same account' *namely* 'reaching'. He approaches his relatives as and when he likes as stated in the text, 'He moves about there eating, playing and enjoying' (*Chānd.* VIII-12-2). This is the fruit of his attainment of the final release. It is not the fruit connected with *Samsāra*. Therefore the *Vidyā* covering His qualities is also the *Paravidyā*.

[1] इत्यादि M 1.

तन्निर्धारणानियमाधिकरणम् १७

तन्निर्धारणानियमस्तद्दृष्टेः ; पृथग्घ्यप्रति- बन्धः फलम् ॥ ४१ ॥

उद्गीथाद्युपासनस्य क्रतुषु गोदोहनादिवदुपादानानियमः । "तेनोभौ कुरुतो यश्चैतदेवं वेद यश्च न वेद" [1]इत्युद्गीथोपासनरहितस्यापि [2]क्रत्वनुष्ठान-दर्शनात् । "यदेव विद्यया करोति तदेव वीर्यवत्तरम्" इति वर्तमान-निर्देशेऽपि क्रतुवीर्यवत्तरत्वसाधनतयोपासनविधिः कल्प्यते । वीर्यवत्तरत्वं[3]

TANNIRDHĀRAṆĀNIYAMĀDHIKARANA 17

41. *Tannirdhāraṇāniyamastaddrṣṭeḥ ; pṛthagghya-pratibandhaḥ phalam* .

There is no necessity of undertaking of the meditation on the *Udgītha*, because it is so seen in the scriptures. The non-obstruction is the separate fruit for it.

It is not necessary that the meditation on the *Udgītha* should be adopted in the sacrifices, as in the case of the *Godohana* (milk-pail), because even those, who do not meditate on the *Udgītha* are seen to perform the sacrifices. The scriptural text in support of this view is this. 'Therefore those who meditate on this and those who do not meditate on this both perform the sacrifices' (*Chānd.* I-1-10). The present tense is used in the text, 'That which is performed with the knowledge, will have powerful effect' (*Chānd.* I-1-10). Even then, the meditation is assumed to be an object of the injunction, as it grants powerful effect to

[1] उद्गीथ omitted M 1. [2] तदनुष्ठान M 1. [3] वीर्यवत्त्वं M 2.

नाम प्रबलकर्मान्तराप्रतिबन्धेनाविलम्बितफलत्वम् । अतः क्रतुफलात् पृथक्फलमुद्गीथोपासनमित्यनियमः ॥

प्रदानाधिकरणम् १८

प्रदानवदेव तदुक्तम् ॥ ४२ ॥

दहरविद्यायामपहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणविशिष्टोपासने तत्तद्गुणविशिष्टस्वरूपभेदात् प्रतिगुणं गुण्यावृत्तिः, "इन्द्राय राज्ञे" इत्यादिषु विशिष्टस्वरूप-

the sacrifice. 'The vigorous effect' means 'the power of granting the fruits without delay, as no obstruction is caused by other more powerful deeds'. Therefore the meditation on the *Udgītha* gives fruit, other than that which is obtained by the performance of sacrifice and hence there is no insistence on the meditation in this case.

PRADĀNĀDHIKARANA 18

42. *Pradānavadeva taduktam*

Just as in the case of the offerings. This has been explained.

In the *Daharavidyā*, there is the mention of the meditation on the *Brahman*, as possessed of attributes, such as 'being devoid of evil, etc.' There will be the repetition of the meditations on the *Brahman* when He is viewed to possess various qualities one after another, because in each case He is considered to be varied on account of the connection with each of the qualities. This case is analogous to that of the sacrifical offerings. There is the text, 'He is to offer a *Purodāśa* to *Indra* the ruler, etc.' (*Tait. Sam.* II-3-6). The essential nature of *Indra* changes, as his attributes are mentioned one

भेदात् प्रदानावृत्तिवत् । तदुक्तम्—"नाना वा देवतापृथक्त्वात्" इति ॥

लिङ्गभूयस्त्वाधिकरणम् १९

लिङ्गभूयस्त्वात्तद्धि बलीयस्तदपि ॥ ४३ ॥

"सहस्रशीर्षं देवम्" इत्यत्र नारायणशब्देन प्रकृतदहरविद्योपास्यमात्रं[1] न विशेष्यते; अपितु सर्वपरविद्यासूपास्यम्, तच्चिह्नभूतवाक्यभूयस्त्वादेव । अक्षरशिवशंभुपरब्रह्मादिशब्दैः सर्वोपास्याननूद्य नारायणत्वं हि

after another. At each time the oblation of the *Purodāśa* has to be repeated. This has been stated thus—'As the divinities are different, the oblations are different' (*Saṁ. Kānda.* I-13-15).

LIṄGABHŪYASTVĀDHIRARANA 19

43. *Liṅgabhūyastvāt taddhi balīyastadapi*

On account of a good number of indicatory marks; because that proof is stronger. This is so stated elsewhere.

The word, *Nārāyaṇa*, occurs in the text, 'The thousand-headed God etc.' (*Tait.* II-11-1). This is not a specification of the object of the meditation of the *Daharavidyā* alone mentioned therein. It has to be taken as a specification of the objects of all the *Vidyās* mentioned in different texts; because there are many statements containing particular significances in favour of this decision. Indeed, these statements while referring the objects of the meditations with the words *Aksara, S'aṁbhu, S'iva, Supreme Brahman* etc. specify that these objects are nothing but *Nārāyaṇa*. The sentences,

[1] मात्रं omitted A 1, M 3.

विधीयते। प्रकरणाद्धि वाक्यं बलीयः। तदपि "श्रुतिलिङ्ग" इत्यादिनोक्तम् ॥

पूर्वविकल्पाधिकरणम् २०

पूर्वविकल्पः प्रकरणात्स्यात्क्रिया मानसवत् ॥ ४४ ॥

"[1]मनश्चितो वाक्चितः प्राणचितः" इत्यादिसांपादिकाग्नीनाम्[2] "असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्" इत्यादिना पूर्वप्रकृतेष्टकचिताग्निशेषिभूत-

which contain specific indications, have a greater proving power, than the context. This also has been stated in the *Pūr. Mīm. Sū.* III-3-14).

PŪRVAVIKALPĀDHIKARANA 20

44. *Pūrvavikalpaḥ prakaraṇāt syāt kriyā mānasavat*

There is option with regard to what precedes, on account of the context; and hence it is an action, as in the case of the *Mānasagraha*.

In the text, 'Built of mind, built of speech, built of *Prāna*' [3](*Agnirahasya* of Vājasaneyins), are mentioned the metaphorical representations of the fire. These have to be connected with the sacrifices, which are of the nature

[1] मनश्चीयते इत्यर्थे 'कर्मण्यग्न्याख्यायाम्' इति क्विपि निष्पन्ना मनश्चिदादय शब्दाः। अतो मनश्चित इत्यादयो बहुवचनान्ता इति बोध्यम्।

[2] सांपादिकाग्नीनामिति; संपादिताग्नीनामित्यर्थः। सपादमर्हतीत्यर्थे तदर्हतीति ठक्रिः रूपमिति बोध्यम्।

[3] *Agnirahasya* is represented by the 10 th chapter of the *Satapatha-brāhmana* of the *Vājasaneya* school following the *Mādhyamdine* recension (Printed and published by Dr A Weber, Berlin 1855) The *Agnirahasyopaniṣad* printed and published in Grantha character with Rangarāmānuja's commentary at Kumbakonam, is a summary of the 4 th section of the 10 th chapter said above.

क्रियामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेशः स्यात्। एषामग्नित्वेनेष्टकचिताग्निना विकल्पः। द्वादशाहाङ्गभूतमानसग्रहवदेषां मानसानामपि क्रियामयक्रत्वङ्गत्वं न विरुद्धम्॥

अतिदेशाच्च ॥ ४५ ॥

"तेषामेकैक एव तावान् यावानसौ पूर्वः" इतीष्टकचिताग्निकार्यातिदेशाच्च तदङ्गत्वम्॥

विद्यैव तु निर्धारणाद्दर्शनाच्च ॥ ४६ ॥

of the principal ones having the fire in the alter built with bricks as a subordinate; which fire is referred to in the text, 'Or non-existent (*Asat*) alone was in the beginning'. Here the doubt is that these are alternative ones to the fire seated in the altar made of bricks. This is similar to the case of the *Soma* cup imagined by mind in the sacrifice of 12 days. No contradiction arises; because they may conveniently be auxiliary elements in sacrificial performances though they are imagined by mind.

45. *Atidesācca*

And on account of the transfer.

The text 'Of these each one is as great as the previous one' (*Mādh. S'* Br. 10-4-1-3) transfers the power of the fire seated in the altar of bricks, to the fire of mind. Therefore the fire of mind, etc. become auxiliaries to the sacrificial performances.

46. *Vidyaiva tu nirdhāraṇād darsanācca*

But it is *Vidyā* (meditation) only; on account of determination and what is seen in the texts.

विद्यैवैते ; विद्यामयक्रत्वङ्गभूता इत्यर्थः । सांपादिकाग्नित्वेनैषां विद्यामयत्वे सिद्धेऽपि " ते हैते विद्याचित एव " इति निर्धारणं हि विद्यामयक्रत्वन्वयेन[1] विद्यामयत्वख्यापनाय । दृश्यते चात्र विद्यामयः क्रतुः "[2]मनसैषु ग्रहा अगृह्यन्त " इत्यादौ ॥

श्रुत्यादिबलीयस्त्वाच्च न बाधः ॥ ४७ ॥

" ते हैते विद्याचित एव । विद्यया हैवैत एवंविदश्चिता भवन्ति "

These fires of the mind etc. belong to the class of meditation only. The meaning is that these fires are auxiliaries to the sacrifices of meditation. They are determined to be of meditation, as there is in them the metaphorical representation of fires as stated in the text 'Indeed, they are verily made of thought' (*Mādh. S'.* Br. 10-4-1-12). They have been determined in that way in order to reveal that they belong to the class of meditation, as they are connected with the sacrifice of meditation. Here it is seen that there are scriptural texts to prove that the sacrifices could be of the mind. 'By the mind, the cups were taken' (*Mādh. S'. Br.* 10-4-1-3) and so on.

47. *S'rutyādibalīyastvācca na bādhaḥ*

And there cannot be annulment, on account of the scriptural text etc. being more powerful than other proofs.

There cannot be refutation as regards the connection of these with the sacrifice of the meditation by the context that is weaker. Because this fact is understood by the statements

[1] क्रत्वङ्गत्वे A 1. [2] मनसैवैतेषु A 1.

इति श्रुत्या वाक्येन[1] चावगतत्वात्[2] विद्यामयक्रत्वन्वयस्य दुर्बलप्रकरणेन न बाधः ॥

अनुबन्धादिभ्यः प्रज्ञान्तरपृथक्त्ववद् दृष्टश्च तदुक्तम् ॥ ४८ ॥

"[3]मनसैषु ग्रहा अगृह्यन्त" इत्यादिक्रत्वनुबन्धैः "ते हैते विद्याचित एव" इति श्रुत्यादिभिश्चात्र विद्यामयक्रतुविधिः कल्प्यते । दहरविद्यादीनां क्रियामयात्पृथक्त्ववदस्यापि विद्यामयक्रतोः सानुबन्धैस्तैः पृथक्त्वमव-

with the association of clear terms and also by the scriptural text, 'Indeed, they are made by the thought only. For thought alone they are made for him who knows this' (*Mādh. S'. Br.* 10-4-1-12).

48. *Anubandhādibhyaḥ prajñāntarapṛthaktvavad dṛṣṭaś'ca taduktam*

On account of the statement of the connected things, this is different as in the case of other meditations. This has been seen in other texts, and it has been so declared.

The statement of the things connected with the sacrifice is seen in the text, 'By the mind the sacrificial cups have been taken' (*Mādh. S'.* B*r.* 10-4-1-3). There are also scriptural texts to show that there are sacrifices of meditation—'By thought alone are they made' (*Mādh. S'. B.* 10-4-1-12). It is understood that the sacrifice of meditation is ordained in the above mentioned texts. This is known

[1] समभिव्याहाररूपवाक्यप्रमाणेनेत्यर्थः. [2] अवगतविद्यामय etc. A 1, Pr.
[3] मनसैषु omitted A 1, M 2, 3.

गम्यते । दृष्टश्चानुवादसरूपेऽपि विधिः "यदेव विद्यया करोति" इत्यादौ । तदुक्तम्—"वचनानि त्वपूर्वत्वात्" इति ॥

न सामान्यादप्युपलब्धेर्मृत्युवन्न हि लोकापत्तिः ॥ ४९ ॥

"तेषामेकैक एव तावान् यावानसौ" इतीष्टकचिताग्निफलसामान्येनातिदेशः; इष्टकचिताग्नेः स्वक्रतुद्वारेण यत्फलं तदेवैषां विद्यामयक्रत्वनुप्रवेशेन फलमिति; न पुनरिष्टकचिताग्निदेशत्वमप्येषामिति । केनापि सामान्येनातिदेशोपलब्धेः; यथा "स एष एव मृत्युर्य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डले

different from the sacrifice of action as in the case of meditations *Daharavidyā* etc. It is seen that the injunctions are meant in the texts that are *Anuvāda*—'He, who does it through the knowledge' (*Chānd.* I-1-10). This has been stated in *Pūr. Mīm. Sū.* III-5-21.

49. *Na sāmānyādapyupalabdhermṛtyuvannahi lokāpattiḥ*

Not so. The transfer is only in respect of some common attributas; as in the case of God of death. It does not mean that the person reaches the region of the god of death.

The text 'Each of these fires has the same effect as seen in that' (*Mādh. S'. Br.* 10-4-1-3) says that whatever fruit is obtained by the means of the fire of the brick-made altar, the same can be obtained by the means of them. It means whatever fruit the fire of brick-made altar can give through the sacrificial action, the same fruit can be got by the means of each of these fires through the sacrifice of the meditation. It does not mean that each of them occupies the

पुरुषः" इति सर्वहरत्वमात्रेण । न हि तत्र मण्डलपुरुषस्य मृत्युदेशत्वम् ॥

परेण च शब्दस्य ताद्विध्यं भूयस्त्वात्त्वनुबन्धः ॥५०॥

परेण च ब्राह्मणेनास्य [1]मनश्चिदादिवाचिनः शब्दस्य [2]विद्यामयप्रतिपादकत्वमवगम्यते। "अयं वाव लोक एषोऽग्निश्चितस्तस्याप एव" इत्यादिना पृथक्फला विद्यैव विधीयते। क्रियाप्रकरणेऽग्निरहस्ये [1]मनश्चिदादीनामनुबन्धस्तु संपादनीयानामग्न्यङ्गानां भूयस्त्वात् ॥

place of the fire of the brick-altar; because the transfer is apprehended in regard to some common fact. Take for example the passage 'The person in the orb is the God of death, indeed' (*Mādh. S'. Br.* 10-3-6-23). Here it is meant that the person causes death to all objects and not that he occupies the world of God of death.

50. *Parēṇa ca s'abdasya tādvidhyaṁ bhūyastvāttvanubandhaḥ*

And by the subsequent text is proved that the word is used in such a meaning. But on account of plurality of the auxiliaries it is found in that context.

The subsequent *Brāhmaṇa* text also proves that the passages relating to the fire of mind, etc., refer to the sacrifice of the meditation only. The text reads thus, 'This fire is this world and the water around it is the sea (*Mādh. S'. Br.* 10-4-2-1). From this, it appears that what is enjoined here is the meditation with a special result of its own. In the *Agnirahasya*, under the section of 'sacrificial rites', is included the portion dealing with the fires of mind, etc., as many auxiliaries have to be applied to them from that context.

[1] मनश्चितादि A 1, Pr. [2] विद्यामयप्रतिपादित्वम् Pr.

शरीरेभावाधिकरणम् २१

एक आत्मनः शरीरे भावात् ॥ ५१ ॥

शरीरे वर्तमानत्वादुपासितुः, तस्य च कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वादिस्वरूपत्वात् तथावस्थितस्यात्मतया परविद्यासु परमात्मोपास्य इत्येके मन्यन्ते ॥

व्यतिरेकस्तद्भावभावित्वान्न तूपलब्धिवत् ॥ ५२ ॥

नैवं यत् [1]कर्तृत्वादिस्वरूपस्यैवोपासितुरात्मतया परमात्मानुसंधेय इति; अपितूपासितुः सांसारिकस्वभावान्मुक्तस्वरूपस्य यो व्यति-

S'ARĪREBHĀVĀDHIKARANA 21

51. *Eka ātmanaḥ s'arīre bhāvāt*

Some state that He has to be meditated upon as the Self of the meditator in his meditating stage, on account of the existence of the meditating soul within the body.

When meditating, the self remains within the body and has the character of being the doer and the enjoyer. Therefore some think that in all the meditations upon the Highest, the Highest Self has to be meditated upon as being the self of those embodied souls.

52. *Vyatirekastadbhāvabhāvitvānnatūpalabdhivat*

It is not so; but rather the difference; since it is of the being of that state; as in the case of intuition.

It is not correct to hold that the meditatior should meditate upon the Highest as the Self of him in the present state comprising the worldly action etc, But in meditating the Highest as his Self, he should realize his state

[1] कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वादि A 1.

रेकोऽपहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणकत्वरूपः सोऽनुसंधेयः, तथानुसंधानभावभावित्वात्[1] तत्स्वरूपोपलब्धेः । यथावस्थितस्वरूपब्रह्मानुसंधानभाविनी हि ब्रह्मोपलब्धिः; तद्वत्; "यथाक्रतुरस्मिन् लोके पुरुषः" इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥

अङ्गावबद्धाधिकरणम् २२

अङ्गावबद्धास्तु न शाखासु हि प्रतिवेदम् ॥ ५३ ॥

उद्गीथादिक्रत्वङ्गाश्रया उपासना यासु शाखासु श्रूयन्ते, तास्वेव कार्या इति [2]न ह्यस्ति नियामकम् । अत उद्गीथानुबन्धित्वात् प्रतिशाखं कार्याः ॥

of virtues comprising the freedom from evils etc., which virtues become manifest themselves when he is released from the bondage of *Saṁsāra* (wordly life). His essential nature could be apprehended in future, only if he is in such a meditation here. Indeed the meditation upon the *Brahman* in His true nature, has for its object the apprehension of the essential nature of the *Brahman*. Same is the case with the individual self also. The scriptural text is this—'According to the purpose which a person has in this world' (*Chānd*. III-14-1).

AṄGĀVABADDHĀDHIKARAṆA 22

53. *Aṅgāvabaddhāstu na s'ākhāsu hi prativedam*

But those meditations, which are connected with the limbs of the sacrifices, are not restricted to particular *S'ākhās* only; but rather belong to all *S'ākhās*.

The meditations, which are connected with the limbs of the sacrifices, such as, *Udgītha*, etc., are mentioned in certain *S'ākhās*. But there is no rule, that they should be restricted to those particular *S'ākhās* only. They belong to all the *S'ākhās*, as they are connected with the *Udgītha*.

[1] सद्भावभावित्वात् M 1, 3. [2] नेहास्ति M 1.

मन्त्रादिवद्वाविरोधः ॥ ५४ ॥

वाशब्दोऽवधारणे । यथा क्रत्वङ्गभूतानां मन्त्राणामेकैकशाखागतानामपि सर्वशाखागतक्रत्वन्वये न विरोधः,[1] तद्वदिहापि ॥

भूमज्यायस्त्वाधिकरणम् २३

भूम्नः क्रतुवज्ज्यायस्त्वम्; तथाहि दर्शयति ॥ ५५ ॥

वैश्वानरविद्यायां त्रैलोक्यशरीरतयोपास्यस्य वैश्वानरात्मनः स्वर्लोकादिपृथिव्यन्तानां [2]मूर्धादिपादपर्यन्तावयवत्वमभिधाय " यस्त्वेतमेवं प्रादेशमात्र-

54. *Mantrādivadvāvirodhaḥ*

Or surely there is no contradiction, as in the case of the *Mantras*, etc.

The word, 'or' is used in the sense of emphasis. The *Mantras*, that are mentioned in each *S'ākhā* as being the limbs of the sacrifices, can be applied to all the *S'ākhās*. Just as there is no contradiction in the case of *Mantras*, here also there is no contradiction.

BHŪMAJYĀYASTVĀDHIKARANA 23

55. *Bhūmnaḥ kratuvajjyāyastvam*; *tathāhi dars'ayati*

There is the pre-eminence in the meditation of the *Bhūman* (the collective aspect of the *Brahman*) as in, the case of the sacrifices; for, thus the scripture declares.

In the *Vais'vānaravidyā* it is stated that there should be the meditation of Him, who has three worlds as His body. All the worlds beginning from the heavens and ending with the earth, constitute His limbs, from the head to the legs etc. The fruit derived from this *Vidyā* is the enjoyment of the

[1] क्रत्वन्वयेनाविरोधः Pr. [2] मूर्धादिपादान्तानाम् A 1.

मभिविमानमात्मानं वैश्वानरमुपास्ते स सर्वेषु लोकेषु" इत्यादिना ब्रह्मानुभवः फलं चाभिहितम्। तत्र मूर्धाद्यवयवोपासनात् भूम्नः समस्तोपासनस्य ज्यायस्त्वं प्रामाणिकत्वमस्ति, तत्रैव ब्रह्मानुभवफलाभिधानात्। तत्रावयवोपासनं तत्र तत्र फलकीर्तनं च क्रताविव द्रष्टव्यम्। यथा "वैश्वानरं द्वादशकपालं निर्वपेत्पुत्रे जाते" इत्युक्त्वा "यदष्टाकपालो भवति" इत्यादौ। तथा समस्तोपासनस्यैव श्रैष्ठ्यं दर्शयति श्रुतिः "दिवमेव भगवो राजन्" इत्यवयवोपासनेऽभिहिते "मूर्धा ते व्यपतिष्यद्यन्मां नागमिष्यः" इत्यादिनानर्थं ब्रुवती॥

Brahman as stated in the text, 'He, who meditates upon Him, Immeasurable, the leader of all men (*Vaiśvānara*), as connected with these places, eats (enjoys) the food (namely the *Brahman*) in all the worlds, etc' (*Chānd.* V-18-1). Here is mentioned the meditation on Him with the aggregate form with the limbs, such as head etc. Suppose there is the meditation on Him with each of the limbs separately. Then there will be only the limited enjoyment. Therefore in order to have unlimited enjoyment, He should be meditated up on in the aggregate form, because this course only is reasonable and the enjoyment on the *Brahman* has been declared in that case only. But the statement of the fruit on the meditation on the limbs separately, is as in the case of the performance of the sacrifices as stated in the text—'When a son is born, one should offer on twelve potsherds to *Vaiśvānara*', and again a separate fruit is stated thus 'There is an offering on eight potsherds,' (*Tait. Sam.* II-2-5). The scriptural text points out the greatness of the meditation on the aggregate form of the *Brahman*. The meditation on the limbs has been mentioned in the text, 'Oh! King! the possessor of the auspicious qualities (the *Bhagavan*), I meditate upon Him as heavens' (*Chānd.*

शब्दादिभेदाधिकरणम् २४

नाना शब्दादिभेदात् ॥ ५६ ॥

सद्विद्याभूमविद्यादीनां ब्रह्मण एकस्यैवोपास्यत्वे तत्प्राप्तेरेव फलत्वेऽप्युपास्यप्रकारभेदाद्विद्याभेदः । प्रकारभेदश्च शब्दान्तराद्यनुबन्धभेदादवगम्यते । पूर्वकाण्डोदितमपि ज्ञानस्याविधेयत्वं ब्रुवतां निरासायेदं पुनरारब्धम् ॥

विकल्पाधिकरणम् २५

विकल्पोऽविशिष्टफलत्वात् ॥ ५७ ॥

V-18-1). But it speaks of the evil consequences of that thus, 'Your head would have fallen off, if you had not come to me' (*Chānd.* V-12-2).

S'ABDĀDIBHEDĀDHIKARAṆA 24

56. *Nānā s'abdādibhedāt*

The meditations are different; because they are called by different names etc.

In *Sadvidyā*, *Bhūmavidyā*, etc., the *Brahman* alone is to be meditated upon and the fruit thereof is His attainment alone. But these *Vidyās* are different from each other; because the modes of the chief object (*Brahman*) of meditations are distinct from each other. That the modes are different has been determined by their denotation by different words etc. This topic was once dealt with in the *Pūrvakāṇḍa* of the *Mīmāṁsā* with reference to the sacrifices, yet it is dealt with again here to dispel the mistaken idea of certain groups of philosophers *namely*, that the *Vedānta* texts do not enjoin the knowledge (meditation).

VIKALPĀDHIKARANA 25

57. *Vikalpoviśiṣṭaphalatvāt*

एकस्मिन्नुपासके सर्वासां परविद्यानां विकल्पः, अपरिच्छिन्नानन्दरूपब्रह्मानुभवफलस्याविशिष्टत्वात् ॥

काम्यास्तु यथाकामं समुच्चीयेरन्न वा, पूर्वहेत्वभावात् ॥५८॥

ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तविद्याफलस्य परिमितत्वात् भूयस्त्वापेक्षया समुच्चयः संभवतीति यथाकामं समुच्चीयेरन्, विकल्पेरन् वा ॥

यथाश्रयभावाधिकरणम् २६

अङ्गेषु यथाश्रयभावः ॥ ५९ ॥

There is option; on account of there being no difference in fruits.

There is option as regards the meditation, that is to be resorted to by the meditators, because there is no difference in the fruits, *namely*, the experience of the *Brahman* in the form of Bliss, without least diminution.

58. *Kāmyāstu yathākāmaṁ samuccīyeran navā, pūrvahetvabhāvāt*

But meditations aiming other objects of desires, may, according to one's desire, be cumulated or not; on account of the absence of the former reason.

The meditations on objects other than the *Brahman*, grant only limited fruits. They are cumulated, as there is the desire to acquire greater fruits. Hence the meditations are either to be cumulated or left to the option of such meditators.

YATHĀS'RAYABHĀVĀDHIKARAṆA 26

59. *Aṅgeṣu yathās'rayabhāvaḥ*

They belong to the limbs, as the bases.

"उद्गीथमुपासीत" इत्युद्गीथाद्यङ्गेष्वाश्रितानामुद्गीथादिवत् क्रत्वङ्गभाव एव। गोदोहनादिवत् स्ववाक्ये फलान्तराश्रवणादुद्गीथादिसंबन्धितया क्रत्वङ्गभावो न विरुध्यत इति ॥

शिष्टेश्च ॥ ६० ॥

"उद्गीथमुपासीत" इति विधेः "यदेव विद्यया करोति" इत्यत्र विध्यभावाच्चाङ्गभावो न विरुद्धः ॥

समाहारात् ॥ ६१ ॥

"उद्गीथमनुसमाहरति" इति वेदनहानावन्येन[1] समाधानं ब्रुवत् वेदनस्याङ्गतां द्योतयति ॥

'Meditate on the *Udgītha*' (*Chand.* I-1-1). Here the meditations upon the *Udgītha* etc that constitute the limbs of the sacrifices, form the part of the sacrifices, because different fruits have not been mentioned in the scriptural text, as in the case of the *Godohana* (milk-pail) Hence no contradiction arises, in holding the meditations as the parts of the sacrifices as they are connected with the *Udgītha*, etc.

60. *S'iṣṭes'ca*

And on account of injunction.

Because there is an injunction—'Meditate on the *Udgītha*' (*Chānd.* I-1-1). There is no injunction in the text, 'That which is acquired through meditation' (*Chānd.* I-1-10). Hence no contradiction arises, if they are considered as parts of the sacrifices.

61. *Samāhārāt*

On account of the rectification.

'He sets right the *Udgītha*' (*Chānd.* I-4-5). Here it is

[1] अन्येन omitted M 1, M 2, 3.

गुणसाधारण्यश्रुतेश्च ॥ ६२ ॥

प्रकृतोपासनस्यैव "ओमित्याश्रावयत्योमिति शंसत्योमित्युद्गायति" इति सर्वत्र संचरतः प्रणवस्य गुणत्वेनोपासनस्यापि संचारादुपासनोपादाननियमो गम्यते । अतः पूर्वोक्तोपादानानियमो न संभवति ॥

न वा तत्सहभावाश्रुतेः ॥ ६३ ॥

नैतत्, अङ्गभावाश्रुतेः । अङ्गभावो हि सहभावः । "यदेव विद्यया करोति तदेव वीर्यवत्तरम्" इति फलान्तरसाधनतयावगतस्योपासनस्याङ्ग-

stated that the *Udgītha* must be rectified by another priest if it is sung without the meditation. Therefore it proves that the meditation is a constituent element of the sacrificial performance.

62. *Guṇasādhāraṇyaśrutesca*

And on account of there being the scriptural texts, in which the secondary thing is stated to be common in all the cases.

'With *Om* induces, with *Om* recites, with *Om* sings loudly' (*Chānd.* I-1-9). Thus the *Pranava* is used in all the cases. Therefore the *Upāsana* also must continue in all the cases invariably. Therefore it is not proper to hold that there is no necessity to connect the meditation with the sacrifices as state above.

63. *Na vā tatsahabhāvāśruteḥ*

It is not that; because the text does not declare their going together.

This is not so; because there are no texts to show that they constitute the limbs. Indeed the term 'going-together', means 'being the limbs'. From the following text it is understood that the meditation has a separate fruit—'What

भावासंभवात्; "उद्गीथमुपासीत" इत्युद्गीथाश्रयतामात्रप्रतिपादनात् ॥

दर्शनाच्च ॥ ६४ ॥

"एवंविद्ध वै ब्रह्मा यज्ञं यजमानं सर्वांश्चर्त्विजोऽभिरक्षति" इति ब्रह्मणो वेदनेन सर्वरक्षणं ब्रुवती श्रुतिरुद्गातृप्रभृतीनां वेदनस्यानङ्गतां दर्शयतीत्युपादानानियमः[1] सिद्धः ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे तृतीयस्याध्यायस्य तृतीयः पादः ॥

---

he does with the knowledge, that is more powerful' (*Chānd.* I-1-10). Therefore it cannot be a part. The text, 'Meditate on the *Udgītha*' (*Chānd.* I-1-1) states merely that the meditation should be on *Udgītha*.

64. *Darśanācca*

And because the scripture declares it.

'The *Brahman*-priest, who knows this, saves the sacrifice, the sacrificer, and all the officiating priests' (*Chānd.* IV-17-10). This text declares that all are saved through the knowledge of the *Brahman*-priest and that the knowledge on the part of the priests *Udgātṛ* etc. is not auxiliary of the sacrifice. Therefore there is no necessity to connect the meditations with the sacrifices.

THUS ENDS THE 3RD PĀDA OF THE 3RD ADHYĀYA.

---

[1] उपासनोपादानानियमः Pr.

तृतीयाध्याये चतुर्थः पादः ॥

पुरुषार्थाधिकरणम् १

पुरुषार्थोऽतः शब्दादिति बादरायणः ॥ १ ॥

विद्यातः पुरुषार्थ इति भगवान् बादरायणो मेने । " ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम् " " यो वेद निहितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन् । सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह । ब्रह्मणा " इत्यादिशब्दात् ।

ADHYĀYA III, PĀDA IV

PURUṢĀRTHĀDHIKARANA 1

1. *Puruṣārthotaḥ s'abdāditi Bādarāyaṇaḥ*

The cardinal benefit of life starts from thence, on account of the scriptural text: thus *Bādarāyaṇa* opined.

The illustrious *Bādarāyana* thinks that the cardinal benefit of life results from knowledge. The scriptural authorities are these: 'The knower of the *Brahman* reaches the Highest' (*Tait.* I-2-1). 'He, who knows Him set down in the secret abode, enjoys in the highest heaven, all desires as well as the *Brahman*' (*Taiț.* I-2-1).

शेषत्वात्पुरुषार्थवादो यथान्येष्विति जैमिनिः ॥ २ ॥

"तत्त्वमसि" इत्यादिसामानाधिकरण्येन कर्मसु कर्तुरेव ब्रह्मत्वावगमात् तद्वेदनस्य तत्संस्कारतया कर्मशेषत्वात् द्रव्यादिष्विव फलश्रुतिरर्थवाद इति [1]जैमिनिराचार्यो मन्यते ।

आचारदर्शनात् ॥ ३ ॥

अश्वपतिः केकयो ब्रह्मविदाह "यक्ष्यमाणो ह वै भगवन्तोऽहम्" इति । एवमादौ ब्रह्मविदः कर्मप्रधानाचारदर्शनात् विद्या कर्माङ्गम् ।

2. *S'eṣatvāt puruṣārthavādo yathānyeṣviti Jaiminiḥ*

On account of its being subordinate, the statement of the benefit in its case is only *Arthavāda* as in other cases, so *Jaimini* thinks.

In the text, 'That thou art' (*Chānd.* VI-8-7) the agent of the action is apprehended to be *Brahman*, on account of the grammatical equation (Sāmānādhikarnya). The knowledge on him is subservient to the works performed, so far as it produces certain consecration in the agent. The texts, that mention the fruits of the knowledge are only *Arthavādās*, (exaggeration) as in the case of the sacrificial things, etc.

3. *Ācāradars'anāt*

On account of such *Ācāra* (practice) being seen.

As'vapati Kekaya, the knower of the *Brahman*, said, 'Verily, O illustrious ones, I am about to perform a sacrifice' (*Chānd.* V-11-5). Hence it is seen in this and other scriptural texts that the conduct of those, who know the *Brahman*, is

[1] इति जैमिनिराचार्यो मन्यते omitted A. 1. M 2, Pr.

तच्छ्रुतेः ॥ ४ ॥

"यदेव विद्यया करोति" इति श्रुत्यैव विद्यायाः कर्मसु विनियोगात् विद्या कर्माङ्गम्[1] । यत्करोति तद्विद्ययेति हि श्रुतिः । यद्विद्यया साधनभूतया कर्म करोति तत्कर्म वीर्यवत्तरमिति वा ।

समन्वारम्भणात् ॥ ५ ॥

"तं विद्याकर्मणी समन्वारभेते" इति विद्याकर्मणोरेकस्मिन् पुरुषे साहित्यदर्शनाच्च विद्या कर्माङ्गम् ।

guided by the performance of works. Hence knowledge is an auxiliary part of works.

4. *Tacchruteḥ*

It is so, on account of that being stated in the scriptures.

The knowledge is an auxiliary part of the works as it has to be utilised for the performance of works. This is stated in the text, 'whatever one does, with knowledge' (*Chānd.* I-1-10). The meaning of this text is this—Whatever one does, he does with knowledge. Or it means—That work, which one does with knowledge, is more powerful.

5. *Samanvārambhaṇāt*

On account of taking hold together.

The knowledge is an auxiliary part of works; because both are seen to go together in one person, as stated in the text, 'Then both knowledge and work take hold of him' (*Bṛh.* VI-4-4).

[1] विद्या कर्माङ्गम् omitted. A 1. Pr.

तद्वतो विधानात् ॥ ६ ॥

"आचार्यकुलाद्वेदमधीत्य + अभिसमावृत्य कुटुम्बे" इत्यादावर्थ-ज्ञानपर्यन्ताध्ययनवतः कर्मविधानाच्च । अध्ययनं ह्यर्थज्ञानपर्यन्तम् ।

नियमाच्च[1] ॥ ७ ॥

"कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतं समाः [2]इत्यात्मविदो जीवनस्य कर्मसु विनियोगाच्च ।

अधिकोपदेशात्तु बादरायणस्यैवं तद्दर्शनात् ॥ ८ ॥

6. *Tadvato vidhānāt*

On account of injunctions for him who has it.

'He, having learnt the *Veda* from the house of teachers and having come back, must set up himself in the family life' (*Chānd.* VIII-15-1). Here the injunction is that the works must be performed by him who has learnt the *Vedas* together with meaning. The Study of the *Vedas* naturally includes the knowledge of their meaning also.

7. *Niyamācca*

And on account of a definite rule.

The life of the self, who knows the Self, has to be spent in doing the works. The relevant text is this: 'Verily doing works here, let a man desire to live a hundred years' (*Īśa.* II).

8. *Adhikopadeśāttu Bādarāyaṇasyaivaṁ taddarśanāt*

But, on the ground of the teaching about the Highest One, *Bādarāyaṇa* stands firm in his view; because this is seen in the scriptures.

[1] च omitted in A 1. M 1. Pr. [2] इत्यादावात्मविदः M 3.

न विद्या कर्माङ्गम्। अपितु विद्यातः पुरुषार्थ इत्येवमेव भगवतो बादरायणस्य मतम्; कर्तुः प्रत्यगात्मनोऽर्थान्तरभूतस्यैव वेद्यतयोपदेशात्। [1]तत्कथम्? "बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति" "स कारणं करणाधिपाधिपः" इत्यादिवाक्येषु वेद्यस्याधिक्यदर्शनात्।

तुल्यं तु दर्शनम् ॥ ९ ॥

विद्यायाः प्राधान्येऽपि तुल्यमाचारदर्शनम्। "ऋषयः कावषेयाः किमर्था वयमध्येष्यामहे" इत्यादौ ब्रह्मविदां कर्मत्यागो हि[2] दृश्यते। अनुष्ठानं तु फलाभिसंधिरहितस्य विद्याङ्गत्वेन। त्यागस्तु फलाभिसंधियुक्तस्येति न विरोधः।

The view of the *Bādarāyaṇa*, is this—Knowledge is not an auxiliary part of works, 'But the cardinal benefit of life is the result produced by knowledge.' Because the teaching is that the knowledge of One, who is other than the individual self, is to be obtained. How could this be? Because in the following scriptural text, the Highest One is mentioned to be known—'May I become many' (*Chānd.* VI-2-3.). 'He is the cause, He is the Lord of the lords of the senses (*i. e.*, the individual selves), (*S've.* I. 19).

9. *Tulyaṁ tu dars'anam*

But the declarations are of equal wight.

The practice is of equal wight even regarding the importance of knowledge. Even those, who knew the *Brahman,* are known to have abandoned all works. The relevant text is this—'The sages, who are the descendants of *Kavaṣa* said, 'For what purpose should we study the Veda? But

[1] कथम् M 2.

[2] हि omitted M 3.

असार्वत्रिकी ॥ १० ॥

"यदेव विद्यया करोति" इति न सार्वत्रिकी विद्योच्यते, "यदेव विद्यया" इति प्रसिद्धवन्निर्देशात्। प्रसिद्धिश्चोद्गीथविद्यायाः। "यदेव विद्यया करोति तदेव वीर्यवत्तरं भवति" इति प्रकृतोद्गीथविद्यायुक्तस्य कर्मणो हि वीर्यवत्तरत्वसाधनभावो विधीयते।

विभागः शतवत् ॥ ११ ॥

"तं विद्याकर्मणी समन्वारभेते" इति विद्याकर्मणोर्भिन्नफलत्वेन

the works, that are performed without any special desire, stand in a subordinate relation to the knowlege. The works that are attached with certain special desires, have to be abandoned. Hence no contradiction arises.

10. *Asārvatrikī*

It does not comprehend all knowledge.

'Whatever he does with knowledge' (*Chānd.* I-1-10). This does not comprehend all knowledge. The knowledge mentioned in the above scriptural text, stands for the well-known knowledge, on the *Udgītha.* 'Whatever he does with knowledge that is more powerful' (*Chānd.* I-1-10). Here the injunction is that the work done with knowledge of the *Udgītha* becomes more powerful.

11. *Vibhāgaḥ śatavat*

There is distribution, as in the case of the hundred.

'Then both knowledge and work take hold of him' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-2). The knowledge and work have different results and

स्वस्मै फलायान्वेतीति विभागः। यथा क्षेत्ररत्नविक्रयिणं [1]शतद्वयमित्यत्र क्षेत्रार्थं शतं, रत्नार्थं शतमिति।

अध्ययनमात्रवतः ॥ १२ ॥

"वेदमधीत्य" इत्यध्ययनमात्रवतः कर्मविधानात् न विद्या कर्माङ्गम्। अध्ययनविधिर्ह्यक्षरराशिग्रहणमात्रे पर्यवस्यतीत्युक्तम्। अर्थावबोधपर्यन्तत्वेऽप्यर्थज्ञानादर्थान्तरभूता 'विद्यात्, उपासीत' इति विहिता विद्या प्रत्ययावृत्तिरूपा।

the distribution is that each of them yields its own result. For example consider the following: When a man is said to have received two hundred coins for selling a field and a gem, it is naturally understood that he received one hundred for the field and one hundred for the gem.

12. *Adhyayanamātravataḥ*

Of him, who has made merely the verbal study of the *Veda*.

The injunction is that works have to be performed by those, who had studied the *Vedas*. Therefore the knowledge is not an integral part of works. It is already stated that the study of the *Veda* means injunction on the to refer to the mere textual recitation. Or granting that the study of the *Vedas* includes knowing the meaning also, the knowledge, that is different from knowing the meaning of the *Vedas*, is stated to be one of the meditations to be repeated again and again.

[1] शतद्वयमन्वेतीत्यत्र Pr.

नाविशेषात् ॥ १३ ॥

"कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि" इत्यत्र स्वतन्त्रे कर्मणि विद्वदायुषो विनियोग इति विशेषहेत्वभावात् "ईशा वास्यमिदं सर्वम्" इति प्रकरणाच्च विद्याङ्गभूतमेव तत्कर्मेति ज्ञायते । अतो न विद्या कर्माङ्गम् ।

स्तुतयेऽनुमतिर्वा ॥ १४ ॥

विद्यास्तुतये कर्मानुमतिर्वा । विद्यामाहात्म्यात् सर्वदा कर्म कुर्वन्नपि तैर्न लिप्यत इति हि विद्या स्तुता स्यात् । "न कर्म लिप्यते नरे" इति च वाक्यशेषः ।

13. *Nāviśeṣāt*

Not so, on acconnt of non-specification.

The text, 'Necessarily doing works here' (*Īśa.* 2) does not mean that the wise should devote whole of his life in doing independent works not being in the subordinate relation with the knowledge, because there are no specific reasons to hold that view. The context, 'All this is pervaded by the Lord' (*Īśa.* 1) also proves this. Therefore the works are known to form an integral part of knowledge. Hence knowledge is not an integral part of works.

14. *Stutayenumatirvā*

Or the permission is for the purpose of glorification of knowledge.

Or the permission is granted for the performance of works, in order to glorify the knowledge. Indeed the knowledge is glorified by saying that the wise, even by doing works, is not stained, because, the knowledge has such a power,

कामकारेण चैके ॥ १५ ॥

"किं प्रजया करिष्यामः" इत्यादिना कामकारेण गार्हस्थ्यत्याग-मधीयत एके । अतश्च विद्यैव प्रधानभूता ।

उपमर्दं च ॥ १६ ॥

विद्यया सर्वकर्मोपमर्दं[1] चाधीयत एके[2] "क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे" इत्यादिना ।

ऊर्ध्वरेतःसु च शब्दे हि ॥ १७ ॥

The concluding portion of the hymn says accordingly: 'The work does not adheres on the wise'. (*Īśa.* 2).

15. *Kāmakāreṇa caike*

Some also state that the works are to be given up intentionally.

'What shall we do with the offspring?' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-22). Here some state that the life of an householder is to be renounced intentionally. Hence the knowledge alone is the chief.

16. *Upamardaṁ ca*

The destruction of works through knowledge is also stated.

There are the scriptural texts to show that all works are destroyed through knowledge. 'All his works vanish, when the Highest is beheld' (*Muṇḍ.* II-2-8).

17. *Ūrdhvaretassu ca śabde hi.*

And in them, who live in perpetual celibacy, for in scripture this is declared.

[1] मर्दनं A 1. [2] एके omitted M 1, 2. Pr.

ऊर्ध्वरेत स्वाश्रमेषु च[1] विद्यादर्शनात् तेषु चाग्निहोत्राद्यभावान्न विद्या कर्माङ्गम् । ते चाश्रमाः सन्त्येव । "त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः" इति हि वैदिके शब्दे दृश्यते ।

परामर्शं जैमिनिरचोदनाचापवदति हि ॥ १८ ॥

"त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः" इत्यत्र[2] चोदनाभावादुपासनस्तुत्यर्थमनुवादमेव जैमिनिर्मेने । "वीरहा वा एष देवानां योऽग्निमुद्वासयते" इत्यपवदति चाश्रमान्तरम् ।

It is seen that those, who live a life of perpetual celibacy, possess knowledge, even in that particular stage of life. They do not perform *Agnihotra* etc. in that stage. Therefore knowledge cannot be an integral part of works. This stage of life is mentioned in the text, 'The three branches of *Dharma* (*i.e.*, the three states of life, *namely*, the life of the *Brahmacārin* the married life and the life in the forest)' (*Chānd.* II-23-1).

18. *Parāmarśaṁ jaiminiracodanāccāpavadati hi*

A subsequent reference only, *Jaimini* holds them to be; on account of absence of injunction; for scripture forbids that.

Consider the text: 'The three branches of *Dharma*' (*Chānd.* II-23-1). Here *Jaimini* thinks that this is only a subsequent referense (*Anuvāda*) and that it is intended to glorify the meditation; because there is no injunction in the text. Moreover, the life other than that of householder has

[1] च omitted Pr. [2] इत्यादौ M 3.

अनुष्ठेयं बादरायणः साम्यश्रुतेः ॥ १९ ॥

गृहस्थाश्रमवदाश्रमान्तरमप्यनुष्ठेयमिति [1]भगवद्बादरायणमतम्, "त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः" इति सर्वाश्रमसाम्यश्रुतेः ।

विधिर्वा धारणवत् ॥ २० ॥

"उपरि हि देवेभ्यो धारयति" इत्यप्राप्तत्वेन यथा विधिः, तद्वत् ।

been forbidden in the text, 'Now he, who gives up the fire is the slayer of the hero of the gods' (*Tait. Saṁ.* I-5-2).

19. *Anuṣṭheyaṁ Bādarāyaṇaḥ sāmyaśruteḥ*

It is to be accomplished, *Bādarāyaṇa* holds, on account of the scriptural statement in par.

Bādarāyaṇa holds that the other stages of life also should be accomplished in the same way as the life of householder; because the scriptural text, 'The three branches of *Dharma*' (*Chānd.* II-23-1) points out that the three stages of life are in par with each other.

20. *Vidhirvā dhāraṇavat*

Or it is an injunction, as in the case of 'carrying'.

'For, above he carries it for the gods'. This text should be interpreted as an injunction. So also is the case with the text under reference.

[1] भगवत् omitted M 1, Pr.

स्तुतिमात्राधिकरणम् २

स्तुतिमात्रमुपादानादिति चेन्नापूर्वत्वात् ॥ २१ ॥

उद्गीथादिषु रसतमत्वादिदृष्टिविधिर्न संभवति; "इयमेव जुहूः स्वर्गो लोक आहवनीयः" इतिवत् कर्माङ्गभूतोद्गीथाद्युपादाय तस्य रसतमत्ववचनं तत्स्तुतिमात्रमिति चेत्, नैतत्। जुह्वादिविधिवदुद्गीथादिविधेरत्रासंनिधानात्। रसतमत्वादेश्चाप्राप्तत्वाद्रसतमत्वादिदृष्टिविधिरेव।

भावशब्दाच्च ॥ २२ ॥

STUTIMĀTRĀDHIKARAṆA 2

21. *Stutimātramupādānāditi cennāpūrvatvāt.*

If it be paid that they are mere glorification, on account of their reference; not so, on account of the newness.

The text, that mentions the meditation on the *Udgītha*, as the best of the essences, cannot mean an injunction. This is similar to the text, 'The ladle (*Juhū*) is the earth, the *Āhavanīya* is the heavenly world'. *Udgītha* has been mentioned as a constituent element of works. Then to state that as the best of essences is mere glorification on the *Udgītha* and is not an injunction, as in the case of the text, 'The ladle, etc.' It is not so, because there is no injunction of the *Udgītha* in the context as in the case of the ladle. Hence the meditation as the best of essences is to be taken an injunction as it is not establishad by any other proof.

22. *Bhāvaśabdācca*

And on account of the word denoting the injunction.

"उद्गीथमुपासीत" इति विधिप्रत्ययाच्च ।

पारिप्लवाधिकरणम् ३

पारिप्लवार्था इति चेन्न विशेषितत्वात् ॥ २३ ॥

वेदान्तेषु तत्तद्विद्यारम्भेऽधीताः "प्रतर्दनो ह वै" इत्याद्याख्यायिकाः [1]पारिप्लवार्थाः, "आख्यानानि शंसन्ति" इति तत्र विनियोगादिति चेत्, न । तत्रैव "मनुर्वैवस्वतः" इत्याद्याख्यानानां विशेषितत्वात् तेषामेव तत्र विनियोगः ।

तथा चैकवाक्योपबन्धात् ॥ २४ ॥

The text, 'Meditate on the Udgītha' (*Chānd.* I-1-1) has the grammatical suffix indicating the injunction .

PĀRIPLAVĀDHIKARANA 3

23. *Pāriplavārthā iti cenna viśeṣitatvāt*

Should it be said that they are for the purpose of *Pāriplava* (the narration of the stories); not so, since some are specified.

We study in the texts of *Vedānta* in the beginning of the *Vidyās* certain stories, such as that of *Pratardana*, son of *Divodāsa*. (*Kaus*. III-1). These stories are connected with *Pāriplava* (the narration of the stories); because it is stated therein thus : 'They tell the stories'. It is not so. Certain stories such as 'King Manu, son of *Vivasān*' are specified for the purpose. Therefore they only have to be applied for that purpose.

24. *Tathā caikavākyopabandhāt*

And this is so, because they constitute as one sentence.

[1] अत्र पारिप्लवशब्दस्याख्यानशंसनमर्थः ।

विद्याविधिनैकवाक्यत्वाच्च "सोऽरोदीत्" इत्यादिवत् विद्यास्तुत्यर्था एताः ।

अग्नीन्धनाधिकरणम् ४

अत एव चाग्नीन्धनाद्यनपेक्षा ॥ २५ ॥

ऊर्ध्वरेतसाम् "एतमेव प्रव्राजिनो लोकमिच्छन्तः प्रव्रजन्ति" इत्यादिश्रुतेरेव तेषां विद्यावत्त्वात् [1]तेष्वाधानाद्यनपेक्षा विद्या ।

सर्वापेक्षाधिकरणम् ५

सर्वापेक्षा च यज्ञादिश्रुतेरश्ववत् ॥ २६ ॥

These passages narrating the stories constitute one sentence with the injunction. Therefore these are intended to glorify the knowledge, as in the case of the text, 'He cried' (*Taiț. Saṁ.* I-5-1.)

AGNĪNDHANĀDHIKARAṆA 4

25. *Ata evacāgnīndhanādyanapekṣā*

For this very reason, there is no need of the lighting of the fire etc.

Those, who live in perpetual celibacy, possess knowledge. This is stated in the text, 'Those, who want to reach this world, become *Saṁnyāsins*' (*Bṛ.* IV-4-22). Hence knowledge does not require the works Ādhāna etc.

SARVĀPEKṢĀDHIKARAṆA 5

26. *Sarvāpekṣā ca yajñādiśruteraśvavat*

And there is need of all works, on account of the scriptural statement of sacrifices etc. as in the case of the horse.

[1] तेष्वेव A 1.

कर्मवत्सु गृहस्थेष्वग्निहोत्रादिसर्वकर्मापेक्षा विद्या, "ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसानाशकेन" इत्यादिश्रुतेः। यथा चाश्वो गमनसाधनभूतोऽपि स्वपरिकरबन्धापेक्षो गमने, तथा। ऊर्ध्वरेतःसु च स्वाश्रमकर्मापेक्षा।

शमदमाद्यधिकरणम् ६

शमदमाद्युपेतः स्यात्तथापि तु तद्विधेस्तदङ्गतया तेषामप्यवश्यानुष्ठेयत्वात् ॥ २७ ॥

गृहस्थो विहितकर्मव्यापृतोऽपि "शान्तो दान्तः" इत्यादिना

The house-holders have to perform the works. In their case the knowledge presupposes the performance of all the works, such as *Agnihotra*. This is stated in the text—'The *Brāhmaṇas* seek to know Him by sacrifices, by gifts, by penance etc.' (*Bṛ*. IV-4-22). The horse, which is a means of locomotion for men, requires saddle etc. So also is with their case. Those, who lead a permanently celebate life, have to perform the works, that his state of life requires him to do.

S'AMADAMĀDYADHIKARANA 6

27. *S'amadamādyupetaḥ syāt tathāpi tu tadvidhesta-daṅgatayā teṣāmapyavas'yānuṣṭheyatvāt*

However one must be possessed of calmness, control of the senses, etc.; since these are enjoined as auxiliaries to that, and they must necessarily be accomplished.

An house-holder must perform the works, that he has to do according to the injunctions. At the same time he must be calm and must keep the senses under control as enjoined in

शमदमादिविधेस्तद्युक्तः स्यात् । विद्यानिष्पत्तये शमदमादीनामवश्यानुष्ठेयत्वात्; शान्त्युपरतिप्रभृतिभिर्विना [1]विद्यानिष्पत्त्यनुपपत्तेः ।

सर्वान्नानुमत्यधिकरणम् ७

सर्वान्नानुमतिश्च प्राणात्यये तद्दर्शनात् ॥ २८ ॥

प्राणविद्यानिष्ठस्य "न ह वा एवंविदि किंचनानन्नं भवति" इति सर्वान्नानुमतिर्न सर्वदा; अपितु प्राणात्ययापत्तावेव । अतिशयितशक्तेर्ब्रह्मविदोऽप्युच्छिष्टभक्षणादिः प्राणात्ययापत्तावेवेति दर्शनात् ।

अबाधाच्च ॥ २९ ॥

the scriptural text 'Becoming calm, subdued' (*Bṛ.* IV-4-23). In order to acquire the knowledge, one must necessarily possess the calmness etc. because it is not possible to acquire knowledge without the help of these qualities.

SARVĀNNĀNUMATYADHIKARAṆA 7

28. *Sarvānnānumitiś ca prāṇātyaye taddarśanāt*

The permission to take all kinds of food, is only in the case of danger to life; on account of this being seen.

Referring to the meditator on *Prāṇa* (*i.e.*, the vital wind) the scriptural text says 'Verily in the case of him who knows thus, there is nothing that is not eatable' (*Chānd.* V-2-1). This does not mean that he may take all foods at all times. But it is only when there is danger to life, because we see that even the knowers of *Brahman*, who possessed extraordinary powers, ate the impure food, when there was danger to life.

29. *Abādhācca*

And on account of this not being sublated,

[1] विद्योत्पत्त्यनुपपत्तेः M 2.

"आहारशुद्धौ सत्त्वशुद्धिः" इत्याहारशुद्धिविधेरबाधाच्च प्राण-संशय एव ।

अपि स्मर्यते ॥ ३० ॥

"प्राणसंशयमापन्नो योऽन्नमत्ति यतस्ततः" इत्यादिना स्मर्यते च प्राणसंशय एवेति ।

शब्दश्चातोऽकामकारे ॥ ३१ ॥

"तस्माद्ब्राह्मणः सुरां न पिबेत्" इति कामकारनिवृत्तिशब्दश्चात एव; यतः प्राणसंशय एव सर्वान्नानुमतिः ।

There is injunction as regards the taking of pure food. In the text 'If the food is pure, the mind becomes pure' (*Chānd.* VII-26 2). This injunction cannot be sublated. Therefore food of any kind can be taken only when there is danger to life.

30. *Api smaryate*

This is said in *Smṛtis* also.

That any kind of food can be taken only when there is danger to life has been established in the *Smṛti* text 'He, who is in danger of life, eats any food that he gets'.

31. *S'abdas'catokāmakāre*

Therefore there are scriptural statements preventing a person from doing things as he likes.

The text, 'Therefore the *Brāhmana* should not drink *Surā* (*i.e.*, intoxicating drink)' (*Kāṭh. Saṁ.*) prevents a person from doing things as he likes. Therefore all kinds of food may be taken, only when there is danger to life.

विहितत्वाधिकरणम् ८

विहितत्वाच्चाश्रमकर्मापि ॥ ३२ ॥

यज्ञादिकर्म "यावज्जीवमग्निहोत्रम्" इत्यादिना विहितत्वात् विद्यारहितकेवलाश्रमिणामप्यनुष्ठेयम् ।

सहकारित्वेन च ॥ ३३ ॥

"तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन" इत्यादिश्रुतेर्विद्याङ्गतया विधेर्विद्यासहकारित्वेन विदुषा चानुष्ठेयम् ।

सर्वथापि त एवोभयलिङ्गात् ॥ ३४ ॥

VIHITATVĀDHIKARAṆA 8

32. *Vihitatvāccāśramakarmāpi*

The works are also attached to various *Āśramās* on account of these being enjoined.

The works, such as sacrifices, etc. have to be performed by those, who had entered the stages of life (*i.e., Āśramās*), though they do not engage themselves in the meditation. The text is this: '*Agnihotra* has to be performed all through the life' (*Āpa. Śr.* III-24-8).

33. *Sahakāritvena ca*

And also on account of their being helpful in acquiring knowledge.

The works form an integral part of knowledge. This is stated in the text, '*Brāhmaṇas* desire to know Him by the recitation of *Vedas*' (*Bṛ.* IV-4-22). The works are helpful in getting knowledge. Therefore the wise also should perform the works.

34. *Sarvathāpi ta evobhayaliṅgāt*

In any case the works are the same, on account of the signs found in both the cases.

उभयत्र विनियोगेऽपि यज्ञादयस्त एव, उभयत्र प्रत्यभिज्ञानाख्या-लिङ्गात् । कर्मस्वरूपैक्येऽपि विनियोगपृथक्त्वेन न विरोधः ।

अनभिभवं च दर्शयति ॥ ३५ ॥

"धर्मेण पापमपनुदति" इति विद्योत्पत्तिप्रतिबन्धकपापनिवर्तनेन विद्याया अनभिभवं कर्मानुष्ठानकार्यं च दर्शयति ।

विधुराधिकरणम् ९

अन्तरा चापि तु तद्दृष्टेः ॥ ३६ ॥

The works sacrifices, etc. are the same even though they are viewed either as duties or auxiliaries to knowledge because they are recognized to be the same in both the cases. These works are the same in their essential nature. Yet they are performed with different views. Hence no contradiction arises.

35. *Anabhibhavaṁ ca dars'ayati*

And scriptures declare knowledge not be over-powered by works.

All evil works, that stand in the way of the rise of knowledge, are removed. This is stated in the text, 'By works of sacred duty, he drives away evil deeds' (*Tait.* II-50). Thus the text shows that the works have to be performed so that the knowledge is not over-powered, by evil deeds.

VIDHURĀDHIKARANA 9

36. *Antarā cāpi tu taddṛṣṭeḥ*

But also in the case of those who are without the Ās'rama life ; because this is seen.

आश्रमानन्तरा वर्तमानो विधुरादिरनाश्रमी। तस्यापि विद्याधिकारोऽस्ति, रैक्वादिष्वनाश्रमिषु ब्रह्मविद्याधिकारदर्शनात्।

अपि स्मर्यते ॥ ३७ ॥

अनाश्रमिणोऽपि जपादिना विद्यानुग्रहः स्मर्यते "जप्येनापि च संसिध्येत्" इति।

विशेषानुग्रहश्च ॥ ३८ ॥

आश्रमानियतधर्मविशेषैर्विद्यानुग्रहश्च श्रूयते। "तपसा ब्रह्मचर्येण श्रद्धया विद्यया चात्मानम्" इत्यादिना।

Those, who are connected wilh the *Ās'ramas*, such as the widowers, are without *Ās'rama* life. They also are qualified to do the meditation. Because *Raikva* and others, who do not follow any stage of *Ās'rama* life, were seen to have been qualified for the meditation upon the *Brahman.*

37. *Api smaryate*

This is said in the *Smṛtis* also.

The *Smṛti* text, 'through the silent recitation also a man becomes successful' (*Manu.* II-87) proves that the knowledge of the *Brāhman* could be had through the silent recitation etc. by one who is not within the *Ās'rama* life.

38. *Vis'eṣānugrahas'ca*

And the knowledge is benefited through some special works.

The text, 'By penance, abstinence, faith, and knowledge, one has to seek the Self' (*Pra.* I-10) proves that the knowledge is acquired through some special works not exclusively connected with the *Ās'ramas* alone.

अतस्त्वितरज्ज्यायो लिङ्गाच्च ॥ ३९ ॥

अनाश्रमित्वादाश्रमित्वं ज्यायः, धर्मभूयस्त्वात् "अनाश्रमी न तिष्ठेत्तु[1]" इति स्मृतेश्च ।

तद्भूताधिकरणम् १०

तद्भूतस्य तु नातद्भावो जैमिनेरपि नियमात्तद्रूपाभावेभ्यः ॥ ४० ॥

नैष्ठिकादिनिष्ठस्य[2] प्रच्युत्य[3] स्थितिर्न संभवत्येव, नियमात् [4]तद्रू-

39. *Atastvitarajjyāyo lingācca*

But better than this is the other (*i.e.*, the *Aśrama* life); on account of an inferential reason also.

The life of an *Āśramin* is better than that of him, who is not so; because the *Āśramin* has been assigned more duties. The *Smṛti* text says, ' A twice-born should not remain without the *Āśrama* life even for a minute.'

TADBHŪTĀDHIKARAṆA 10

40. *Tadbhūtasyatu nātadbhāvo jaiminerapi niyamāt tadrūpābhāvebhyaḥ*

But of him, who has become that (*Naiṣṭhika* etc.) there is no becoming not that, according to *Jaimini* also; on account of the scripture restraining from the absence of the forms of that.

Those, who have entered once the life of *Naiṣṭhika*, etc., must not live without that life; because as a rule

[1] तिष्ठेत A 1.
[2] नैयमिकादिभूतस्य M 1.
[3] प्रच्युतस्य M 1.
[4] तद्रूपाभावेभ्यः A 1.

पनिवृत्तिभ्यः। यथा नियच्छन्ति हि "अत्यन्तमात्मानमाचार्यकुलेऽव-सादयन्" इति "अरण्यमियात्ततो न पुनरेयात्" इति "संन्यस्याग्निं[1] न पुनरावर्तयेत्" इति च। अतस्तेषां[2] प्रच्युत्य स्थित्यभावाद्विद्यानधिकारः। जैमिनेरप्येवम्[3]।

न चाधिकारिकमपि पतनानुमानात्तदयोगात्॥ ४१॥

"अवकीर्णिपशुश्च तद्वत्" इत्यधिकारलक्षणोक्तं प्रायश्चित्तमपि तस्य न संभवति, तस्य प्रायश्चित्तानधिकारस्मृतेस्तदसंभवात्। "आरू-

men are prohibited from discontinuing the special duties of those *Ās'ramas* after they have once entered on the condition of *Naiṣṭhika*, etc. The relevant scriptural texts are—'Completely surrendering himself to the service in the house of the teacher' (*Chānd.* 2-23-1). 'He is to go to forest, and should not return from thence'. 'Having renounced the fire he should not return'. Hence the persons, who have lapsed from those conditions are not qualified for the knowledge. This is the opinion of *Jaimini* also.

41. *Na cādhikārikamapi patanānumānāt tadayogāt*

Nor the expiatory ceremonies described in the chapter treating of qualifications; that being impossible on account of the *Smṛtis* referring to the apostasy.

The expiatory ceremonies, which are described in the chapter treating of qualifications are not applicable in the case of him, who is apostate by transgressing the rules of the *Naiṣṭhika* etc. The relevant text is this—'Like that, the sacrifice with Avakīrṇipas'u (donkey) should be performed

[1] अग्नीन् M 2. [2] प्रच्युतिभावात् M 3. [3] जैमिनिरप्येवम् M 3.

ढो नैष्ठिकं धर्मम्" इत्यारभ्य "प्रायश्चित्तं न पश्यामि" इत्यादिस्मृतेः ।

उपपूर्वमपीत्येके भावमशनवत्तदुक्तम् ॥ ४२ ॥

उपपातकत्वात् [1]प्रायश्चित्तस्य भावमेके मध्वशननिषेधतत्प्रायश्चित्तवदिति मन्यन्ते । तदुक्तम्—"[2]उत्तरेषां चैतदविरोधि" इति ।

बहिस्तूभयथापि स्मृतेराचाराच्च ॥ ४३ ॥

in the ordinary fire' (*Mī. Sū.* VI-8-22). There are *Smṛti* texts to show that they are not entitled to perform the expiatory ceremonies. The texts are—'If one having once entered the duties of a *Naisthika*, lapses from them, etc, I do not see any expiatory ceremony for him' (*Agni. Pur.* 165-23).

42. *Upapūrvamapītyeke bhāvamaśanavat taduktam*

A minor offence: thus some think; and the existence of expiatory ceremonies, as in the case of eating. This has been explained.

Some think that there are expiatory ceremonies for them; as the offences are minor. This is similar to the case of performing expiatory ceremonies when forbidden food, such as honey etc. is consumed by them. Hence it has been stated thus—'This should be applied in the case of the others also in so far as not opposed to their *Āśramas* (*Gau. Dh.* I-3-4).

43. *Bahistūbhayathāpi smṛteracāracca*

But in either case, such men stand outside, on account of the *Smṛti* text and custom.

[1] प्रायश्चित्तमेके 1 2, Pr.　　　[2] इतरेषां M 2.

उपपातकत्वेऽप्यन्यथापि कर्माधिकारबहिष्कृता एते; तथा स्मृतेः "प्रायश्चित्तं न पश्यामि येन शुध्येत्स आत्महा" इति। शिष्टबहिष्काराच्च।

स्वाम्यधिकरणम् ११

स्वामिनः फलश्रुतेरित्यात्रेयः ॥ ४४ ॥

उद्गीथाद्युपासनं यजमानेनानुष्ठेयम्; तस्यैव क्रतुवीर्यवत्तरत्वादिफलश्रुतेरित्यात्रेयः।

आर्त्विज्यमित्यौडुलोमिस्तस्मै हि परिक्रीयते ॥ ४५ ॥

They are excluded from performing religious works, even when these offences are considered minor or otherwise. The *Smṛti* text in support of this view is this: 'I do not see the expiatory ceremonies, by which the killers of the self can purify themselves' (*Agn. Pur.* 165-23). The good men reject them from their society.

SVĀMYADHIKARAṆA 11

44. *Svāminaḥ phalaśruteritYātreyaḥ*

Ātreya thinks that the master of the sacrifice must do the meditations; because the fruits derived therefrom go to him.

The master of the sacrifice must do the meditations on the *Udgītha*, etc.; because he gets the fruits *viz.*, more power of the sacrifices. Thus *Ātreya* thinks.

45. *Ārtvijyamityouḍulomistasmai hi parikrīyate*

They are the *Ṛtvik's* (*i.e.*, the priests) for the works. Thus Auḍulomi thinks; since for that purpose they have been engaged.

कर्मस्वरूपवत् तदङ्गाश्रयमप्यार्त्विज्यम् । साङ्गफलसाधनकर्मानुष्ठानाय हि ऋत्विक् परिक्रीयते ।

सहकार्यन्तरविध्यधिकरणम् १२

सहकार्यन्तरविधिः पक्षेण तृतीयं तद्वतो विध्यादिवत् ॥४६॥

"तस्माद् ब्राह्मणः पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य" इत्यारभ्य "अथ मुनिः" इत्यत्र [1]विद्यावतो यज्ञादिवत् बाल्यपाण्डित्ययोस्तृतीयं सहकार्यन्तरं मौनं विधीयते, पक्षेण प्रकृष्टमननशीले मुनिशब्दप्रयोगात् । विद्याभ्यासरूपं मननमिदमप्राप्तमेव ।

The works related to the main as well as those that are related to the integral parts, must be performed by the priest *i.e., Ṛtvik.* Indeed the priest is engaged to perform the works till they yield their results.

SAHAKĀRYANTARAVIDHYADHIKARANA 12

46. *Sahakāryantaravidhiḥ pakṣeṇa tṛtīyaṁ tadvato vidhyādivat*

There is injunction of the third auxiliary means for him who possesses that, as in the case of injunctions of other objects; the term, *Muni* is alternatively used to donote the sound meditator.

'Therefore let the *Brāhmaṇa*, after obtaining the learning, wish to stand in a child-like state and after obtaining the child-like state and learning, he must be a *Muni*.' (*Bṛh.* III-5-1). Here the text enjoins the Muni-hood as the third auxiliary the other two being the child-hood and learning. This injunction

[1] विद्यावतः omitted A 1.

कृत्स्नभावात्तु गृहिणोपसंहारः ॥ ४७ ॥

कृत्स्नेष्वाश्रमिषु विद्यासद्भावात्[1] छान्दोग्ये "अभिसमावृत्य कुटुम्बे" इत्यारभ्य "स खल्वेवं वर्तयन्यावदायुषम्" इति गृहिणोपसंहारः सर्वेषां प्रदर्शनार्थः । तुशब्दो गृहिण एवेति शङ्काव्यावृत्त्यर्थः ।

मौनवदितरेषामप्युपदेशात् ॥ ४८ ॥

is like that of sacrifice etc. The word, *Muni* is used to denote him who meditates exclusively and persistently upon the *Brahman*. This kind of meditation which is in the form of the repeated practice of the intuition is not something previousely established.

47. *Kṛtsnabhāvāttu gṛhiṇopasaṁhāraḥ*

But on account of the existence of knowledge in all; the scriptural texts wind up with the house-holder.

The knowledge belongs to the members of all the *Āśramas*. But the following text winds up with the duties of the house-holder—'He, living in this way, throughout his life,' (*Chānd.* VIII-15-1). This must be taken as an illustration. Here the word, 'but' is used to refute the notion that this applies to the house-holder only.

48. *Maunavaditareṣāmapyupadeśāt*

On account of the others also being taught, in the same way as the condition of *Muni*.

[1] संभवात् M 3.

"अथ मुनिः" इत्यत्रापि "अथ भिक्षाचर्यं चरति" इति पारिव्राज्येनोपसंहारः प्रदर्शनार्थः, मौनभिक्षाचर्यवदितराश्रमधर्माणां यज्ञादीनामप्युपदेशात् ।

अनाविष्काराधिकरणम् १३

अनाविष्कुर्वन्नन्वयात् ॥ ४९ ॥

"पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्" इति बाल्यमित्यविशेषेण[1] श्रुतावपि, बालकर्म स्वमाहात्म्यानाविष्काररूपं विद्यान्वययोग्यतया विधीयते ।

•

'Then *Muni*', 'He lives the life of ascetics' (*Bṛ.* III-5-1). Here the text closes with the life of ascetics as an illustration; because there is the teaching of the sacrifices, etc. that have to be performed in other *Āsramas*, as in the case of the *Mauna* and asceticism.

ANĀVIS'KĀRĀDHIKARANA 13

49. *Anāviṣkurvannanvayāt*

Not manifesting his nature; on account of the propriety.

'After obtaining the learning, let him wish to stand by a child-like state' (*Bṛh.* III-5-1). The clause, 'child-like state' though means in general the action of a child, it should be taken to mean, the injunction that he should remain, without manifesting his greatness, because this meaning only is suitable for the context of the meditation.

[1] अविशेषश्रुतावपि A 1.

ऐहिकाधिकरणम् १४

ऐहिकमप्रस्तुतप्रतिबन्धे तद्दर्शनात् ॥ ५० ॥

अभ्युदयफलमुपासनं स्वसाधनभूतपुण्यकर्मानन्तरमुत्पद्यत इति नायं नियमः। प्रबलकर्मान्तरप्रतिबन्धाभावे तदनन्तरम्। प्रतिबन्धे तु तस्मिन् समाप्ते; "तदेव वीर्यवत्तरम्" इति [1]प्रतिबन्धाभावफलदर्शनात्।

मुक्तिफलाधिकरणम् १५

एवं मुक्तिफलानियमस्तदवस्थावधृते-स्तदवस्थावधृतेः ॥ ५१ ॥

AIHIKĀDHIKARANA 14

50. *Aihikamaprastutapratibandhe taddars'anāt*

What belongs to this world, there being no obstruction at hand, as this is seen in the scriptures.

There is no rule that meditations, that grant worldly pleasures, take place immediately after the performance of meritorious deeds, that are capable of yielding those results. They take place immediately, provided there are no powerful works that stand in the way. But when there is obstruction. they take place after the disappearance of such obstruction, This is stated in the scriptural text—'That only becomes more powerful' (*Chānd.* 1-1-10).

MUKTIPHALĀDHIKARAṆA 15

51. *Evaṁ muktiphalāniyamastadavasthāvadhṛtes-tadavasthāvadhṛteḥ*

In the same way there is no rule with regard to

[1] प्रतिबन्धाभावं Pr.

एवं मुक्तिफलोपासनस्यापि प्रतिबन्धभावाभावयोरित्यनियमः, प्रतिबन्धाभाव एवेति फलोदयावस्थावधृतेः[1] ।

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे तृतीयस्याध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः

समाप्तश्चाध्यायः

---

what has the final Release for its result; that condition being ascertained, that condition being ascertained.

Likewise there is no definite rule regarding the meditations, that result in *Mukti.* This means that those meditations take place depending upon the existence of obstruction or the absence of the same. It is determined that the fruits are obtained, only when there is no obstruction.

THUS ENDS THE 4TH PĀDA OF THE 3RD ADHYĀYA.

---

[1] द्विरुक्तिरध्यायपरिसमाप्तिद्योतनाय Added A 1.

चतुर्थाध्याये प्रथमः पादः

आवृत्त्यधिकरणम् १

आवृत्तिरसकृदुपदेशात् ॥ १ ॥

" ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम् " इत्यादिषु मोक्षसाधनं वेदनमसकृदावृत्तम्, " विद्यात्, उपासीत " इति विद्युपास्योरुपक्रमोपसंहारयोर्व्यतिरेकेणोपदेशात् ॥

लिङ्गाच्च ॥ २ ॥

ADHYĀYA IV, PĀDA I

ĀVṚTTYADHIKARAṆA 1

1. *Āvṛttirasakṛdupadeśāt*

Repetition again and again; on account of the teaching.

' The knower of the *Brahman* attains the Highest ' (*Tait.* I-2-1). Here the knowledge, (*i.e.*, *Vedana*) that is mentioned as useful for the attainment of the final release, means the knowledge repeated again and again; because there is the interchange of words, ' Knowing ' and ' Meditating ' in the beginning and the end of the text.

2. *Liṅgācca*

And on account of the inferential mark.

लिङ्गं स्मृतिः । "मां ध्यायन्त उपासते । तेषामहं समुद्धर्ता" "तद्रूपप्रत्यये चैका संततिश्चान्यनिःस्पृहा । तद्ध्यानम्" इत्यादिस्मृतेश्च ॥

आत्मत्वोपासनाधिकरणम् २

आत्मेति तूपगच्छन्ति ग्राहयन्ति च ॥ ३ ॥

यद्यपि "अधिकं तु भेदनिर्देशात्" "अधिकोपदेशात्" इत्यादिषु प्रत्यगात्मनोऽर्थान्तरत्वं ब्रह्मणः प्रतिपादितम्; तथाप्युपासिता "अहं ब्रह्मास्मि" इत्येवोसीत । यतः पूर्वे उपासितारः "त्वं वा अहमस्मि भगवो देवते, अहं वै त्वमसि भगवो देवते" इत्यात्मेत्येवोपगच्छन्ति । उपासितुरर्थान्तरभूतमपि ब्रह्म तानुपासितॄन् स्वात्मभूतं ग्राहयन्ति

'Inferential mark' means *Smṛti texts.* 'Who, with uninterrupted thought, meditate upon me. I lift them up' (*Bhag. Gī.* XII-7). 'The meditation is the peerless and continued representation of that Form without least desire in anything else' (*Viṣ. Pu.* VI-7-91).

ĀTMATVOPĀSANĀDHIKARANA 2

3. *Ātmetitūpagacchanti grāhayanti ca*

But as the Self; thus the wise approach Him and the texts make them apprehend in that way.

In the *Sūtras* II-1-22 & III-4-8 is explained that the *Brahman,* is other than the individual Self. Even then the person, engaged in the meditation should meditate upon Him as, 'I am the *Brahman*'. Because the wise of olden times acknowledged thus—'Then I am, indeed, thou, holy divinity and thou art me'. Thus the devotees acknowledged Him as their Self. The *Brahman* is no doubt other than the individual selves. But the scriptures reveal Him as being the Self

च शास्त्राणि "य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोऽन्तरो यमात्मा न वेद यस्यात्मा शरीरं य आत्मानमन्तरो यमयति स त आत्मा" इत्यादीनि। यथा 'मनुष्योऽहम्' इति मनुष्यशरीरस्य स्वात्मप्रकारैकस्वभावतया प्रकारिणि स्वात्मनि [1]मनुष्यशब्दस्य तद्बुद्धेश्च पर्यवसानं, तथा स्वात्मनोऽपि परमात्मशरीरतया तत्प्रकारस्वभावत्वेनाहंशब्दतद्बुद्ध्योः परमात्मनि पर्यवसानमिति "अहं ब्रह्म" इत्येवोपास्यमिति[2] ॥

प्रतीकाधिकरणम् ३

न प्रतीके न हि सः ॥ ४ ॥

of the meditating individual selves. 'Remaining within the self. He is different from the self, whom the self does not know, of whom the self is the body, who rules the self from within, he is thy Self' (*Bṛ.* III 7-22. *Mādhy.*) In the usage, 'I am the man' the word 'man' which naturally indicates the human body refers to the self and the thought arrived at from the word finally takes the self as the object, because the body is always an adjunct to the self. In a similar way the word, 'I' refers to the Highest self, and the thought arrived at from the word, finally takes the Highest Self as the object who has as His body the individual selves. Therefore the form of the meditation is only as 'I am the *Brahman*'.

PRATĪKĀDHIKARAṆA 3

4. *Na pratīke na hi saḥ*

In the symbol, there is no apprehension as the self; for the Highest self is not meditated upon there.

[1] अहं शब्दस्य M 2 Pr. [2] उपासीतेति M 1.

"मनो ब्रह्म" [1]इत्यादिप्रतीके तु नात्मेति ग्रहणम् । न हि तत्र स परमात्मोपास्यः । परमात्मदृष्ट्या हि मनःप्रभृतीनि[2] ॥

ब्रह्मदृष्टिरुत्कर्षात् ॥ ५ ॥

ब्रह्मण [3]उत्कृष्टत्वात् तद्दृष्ट्या मनआद्युपासनं [4]ह्यभ्युदयाय भवतीति ॥

आदित्यादिमत्यधिकरणम् ४

आदित्यादिमतयश्चाङ्ग उपपत्तेः ॥ ६ ॥

'Let one meditate on the mind as *Brahman*' (*Chānd.* III-18-1). Here the symbol (*i.e.* mind) is not to be meditated as the Self of the meditator. In that meditation the Highest Self is not to be meditated upon. But the mind, etc. have to be viewed as the Highest Self and meditated.

5. *Brahmadṛṣṭirutkarṣāt*

The view of the *Brahman* (in the mind, etc.); is on account of superiority.

The *Brahman* is superior to mind, etc. The meditation on the mind, etc. viewed as the Brahman is for the good of the meditator.

ĀDITYĀDIMATYADHIKARANA 4

6. *Ādityādimatayaścāṅga upapatteḥ*

And the auxiliaries have to be viewed as *Āditya* etc. on account of this being rational.

[1] इत्यादिषु प्रतीकेषु M 3.
[2] प्रभृतीति M 1.
[3] उत्कर्षवत्त्वात् M 1.
[4] हि omitted M 1.

"य एवासौ तपति तमुद्गीथमुपासीत" इत्यादावप्यादित्यादेरेवोत्कृष्टत्वात् उद्गीथादौ तद्दृष्टयः कार्याः ॥

आसीनाधिकरणम् ५

आसीनः संभवात् ॥ ७ ॥

आसीन उपासनं कुर्यात्, तस्यैवैकाग्रतासंभवात्[1] ॥

ध्यानाच्च ॥ ८ ॥

"निदिध्यासितव्यः" इत्युपासनस्य ध्यानरूपत्वाच्चासीनः ॥

'Let a man meditate upon the *Udgītha*, as the sun who shines up' (*Chānd.* I-3-1); Because *Āditya* etc. are the beings of an higher status, the *Udgītha*, etc., have to be viewed as *Āditya* etc.

ĀSĪNĀDHIKARAṆA 5

7. *Āsīnaḥ saṁbhavāt*

Meditation is to be made in a sitting posture; on account of possibility.

The meditation is to be made in a sitting posture; because in that state only it is possible for a man to concentrate his mind on single object.

8. *Dhyānācca*

And because of its being in the form of deep thinking.

The meditation is to be made in a sitting posture; because the meditation is of the form of deep thinking. This is stated in the text, 'The self is to be thought of deeply', (*Bṛh.* VI-5-6).

[1] ऐकाग्र्य Pr.

अचलत्वं चापेक्ष्य ॥ ९ ॥

पृथिव्यादेरचलत्वं चापेक्ष्य "ध्यायतीव पृथिवी" इति प्रयोगात् मनसो निश्चलत्वमासीनस्यैव ॥

स्मरन्ति च ॥ १० ॥

"उपविश्यासने युञ्ज्यात्" [1]इत्यादिना ॥

यत्रैकाग्रता तत्राविशेषात् ॥ ११ ॥

यत्रैकाग्रता तत्र देशे तत्र काल उपासीत,[2] देशकालविशेषाश्रवणात् ॥

9. *Acalatvaṁ cāpekṣya*

And as there is the reference to for immobility.

The mind could be steady only in a sitting posture; because the steadiness of mind can be acqired only by immobility; this stated in the text 'The earth meditates as it were' (*Chānd.* VII-6-1).

10. *Smaranti ca*

And *smṛti* texts teach the same.

'One should practise meditation sitting on a seat' (*Bhag. G.* VI-12) and so on.

11. *Yatraikāgratā tatrāviśeṣāt*

Where concentration of mind is possible, there the meditation has to be made without regard to any place or time.

Suppose the concentration of mind is possible. Then meditation is to be made at that time and in that place;

[1] इत्यादि M 1. [2] उपासीतेति M 1 Pr.

आप्रयाणाधिकरणम् ६

आप्रयाणात्तत्रापि हि दृष्टम् ॥ १२ ॥

आप्रयाणादहरहरुपासनं कार्यम्, " स खल्वेवं वर्तयन्यावदायुषम्" [1]इति दर्शनात् ॥

तदधिगमाधिकरणम् ७

तदधिगम उत्तरपूर्वाघयोरश्लेषविनाशौ तद्व्यपदेशात् ॥ १३ ॥

because there are no texts to show that meditation, should be made at fixed time and fixed places.

ĀPRAYĀṆĀDHIKARAṆA 6

12. *Āprayāṇāt tatrāpihi dṛṣṭam*

Meditation has to be done till death; for there also it is seen.

The meditation has to be done every day till death; because it is so seen in the text, 'He indeed, who lives thus throughout his life' (*Chānd.* VIII-15-1).

TADADHIGAMĀDHIKARAṆA 7

13. *Tadadhigama uttarapūrvāghayoraśleṣavināśau tadvyapadeśāt*

On the attainment of that, there result the non-clinging and the destruction of the future and past sins respectively; this being so declared.

[1] इत्यादि M 1.

उपासने प्रारब्धे तत्सामर्थ्यादेव पूर्वकृताघनाश उत्तराघाश्लेषश्च भवति; "एवं हास्य सर्वे पाप्मानः प्रदूयन्ते" "एवमेवंविदि पापं कर्म न श्लिष्यते" [1]इति श्रुतेः ॥

इतराधिकरणम् ८

इतरस्याप्येवमसंश्लेषः पाते तु ॥ १४ ॥

विदुषः पुण्यस्यापि मोक्षविरोधित्वेनानिष्टफलहेतुत्वसाम्यादेवमश्लेष-विनाशौ। वृष्ट्यन्नायुरारोग्यादिविद्यानुगुणफलस्य कर्मणः शरीरपातादूर्ध्वम-फलत्वम् ॥

When the meditation on the *Brahman* is begun, the past sins become destroyed and the future sins do not cling to him; because the meditations have such a power. The texts that support this are these—'Thus, indeed, all his sins are burnt' (*Chānd.* V-24-3). 'No evil deed clings to him who knows this' (*Chānd.* IV-14-3).

ITARĀDHIKARANA 8

14. *Itarasyāpyevamasaṁśleṣaḥ pātetu*

Of the other also (*i.e.*, the good deeds) there is thus non-clinging and destruction; but after death they do not grant any results.

As regards the wise, the good deeds also are obstructive to the attainment of Final Release and they grant undesirable fruits. They either do not cling to the selves or become destroyed. The works that have to give the results of rain, food, life and health etc. for the help of Vidyā, do not yield any result after death.

[1] इत्यादि M 1.

अनारब्धकार्याधिकरणम् ९

अनारब्धकार्ये एव तु पूर्वे तदवधेः ॥ १५ ॥

विद्याधिगतेः पूर्वकृते पुण्यपापे फलदानायाप्रवृत्ते एव विनश्यतः, "तस्य तावदेव चिरम्" इति शरीरपातावाधित्वश्रुतेः ॥

अग्निहोत्राद्यधिकरणम् १०

अग्निहोत्रादि तु तत्कार्यायैव तद्दर्शनात् ॥ १६ ॥

अग्निहोत्राद्याश्रमकर्म विद्योत्पत्त्याख्यकार्यायैवाप्रयाणादनुष्ठेयम् ।

ANĀRABDHAKĀRYĀDHIKARANA 9

15. *Anārabdhakārye evatu pūrve tadavadheḥ*

But only those former works, the effects of which are not yet begun (become destroyed); on account of that being the limit.

Only those good and evil deeds performed before the acquisition of knowledge perish, the effects of which have not begun to operate; because of the texts—'For him there is delay only as long as he is not delivered from the body' (*Chānd.* VI-14-2) say that they last till death.

AGNIHOTRĀDYADHIKARAṆA 10

16. *Agnihotrādi tu tatkāryāyaiva taddarśanāt*

But the *Agnihotra*, etc. are for that effect only (*i.e.*, the production of knowledge); this being seen in the scriptural texts.

Agnihotra, etc. that are prescribed with reference of *Āśramas*, have to be performed till death, as they produce

" तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन " इत्यादिना विद्योत्पत्तिकार्यत्वं ह्याश्रमधर्मस्य दृष्टम् ॥

अतोऽन्यापि ह्येकेषामुभयोः ॥ १७ ॥

" तस्य पुत्रा दायमुपयन्ति " " द्विषन्तः पापकृत्यां सुहृदः साधु-कृत्याम् " इत्यादिवचनस्याग्निहोत्रादेरन्याप्यनादिकालप्रवृत्ता साधुकृत्या प्रबलकर्मप्रतिबद्धफला उत्तरा वृष्ट्यन्नादिविद्यानुगुणफला प्रतिबद्धफला चेति पूर्वोत्तरकृतयोरुभयोरप्यस्त्येव विषयः ॥

यदेव विद्ययेति हि ॥ १८ ॥

the effect, *namely*, the production of knowledge. ' *Brāhmanas* seek to know Him by the study of the *Vedas* ' (*Brh.* IV-4-22). From this it is understood that the works prescribed with reference to the *Āśramas* are intended for the production of knowledge.

17. *Atonyāpi hyekeṣāmubhayoḥ*

According to some, a class of good works, other than these of both kinds.

Consider the texts—' His sons get a share of properties'. ' His evil deeds cling to his enemy. His good-deeds attach themselves to his friends'. Some good works, other than the *Agnihotra* etc. are performed from time immemorial They are obstructed from granting fruits by other works of greater strength. The strong works obstruct also the grant of fruits, such as rain, food, life and health etc., of the subsequent works. Hence the scriptural texts mentioned above refer to these both kinds of deeds.

18. *Yadeva vidyayeti hi*

For there is the text, ' Whatever he does with knowledge ' (*Chānd.* I-1-10).

"यदेव विद्यया" इत्यत्र फलप्रतिबन्धोऽस्तीति ह्युक्तम् ॥

इतरक्षपणाधिकरणम् ११

भोगेन त्वितरे क्षपयित्वाथ संपद्यते ॥ १९ ॥

आरब्धकार्ययोः पुण्यपापयोर्यत्फलं तदेकशरीरावसानमनेकशरीरावसानं वा भुक्त्वैव तदनन्तरं ब्रह्म प्राप्नोति ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे चतुर्थस्याध्यायस्य प्रथमः पादः ॥

For there is the text, 'whatever he does with knowledge' (*Chānd.* I-1-10).

ITARAKṢAPAṆĀDHIKARAṆA 11

19. *Bhogenatvitare kṣapayitvātha sampadyate*

But having destroyed the two kinds of deeds, by the enjoyment of their fruits he reaches the *Brahman.*

Some good and bad deeds begin to yield fruits. These fruits have to be enjoyed in one life or in many lives. Then he attains the *Brahman.*

THUS ENDS THE 1ST PĀDA OF THE 4TH ADHYĀYA.

चतुर्थाध्याये द्वितीयः पादः ॥

वागधिकरणम् १

वाङ् मनसि दर्शनाच्छब्दाच्च ॥ १ ॥

"अस्य सोम्य पुरुषस्य प्रयतो वाङ् मनसि संपद्यते" इति शब्दात्, उत्क्रान्तौ मनसः प्रागेव वाच उपरतिदर्शनाच्च वाङ् मनसि संपद्यते संयुज्यत इति[1] ॥

अत एव सर्वाण्यनु ॥ २ ॥

ADHYĀYA IV, PĀDA II

VĀGADHIKARANA 1

1. *Vāṅ manasi darśanācchabdācca*

Speech reaches the mind, on account of this being seen and of scriptural statement.

The scriptural statement is this: 'O dear, when a man departs from hence, his speech is combined with mind' (*Chānd.* VI-8-6). Suppose a person departs from this world. In his case the organ of speech stops working even before his mind ceases to function. Hence it is right to say that speech reaches the with mind.

2. *Ata eva sarvāṇyanu*

And for the same reason all follow after it.

[1] संयुज्यत इति omitted, M 1, 2 Pr.

अत: "[1]सर्वेन्द्रियैर्मनसि संपद्यमानैः" इति शब्दात्, उपरतिदर्शनाच्च वाचमनु सर्वाणीन्द्रियाणि मनसि[2] संयुज्यन्ते ॥

मनोऽधिकरणम् २

तन्मनः प्राण उत्तरात् ॥ ३ ॥

उत्तरात् "मनः प्राणे" इति शब्दात् सर्वेन्द्रिययुक्तं मनः प्राणे संयुज्यते ॥

अध्यक्षाधिकरणम् ३

सोऽध्यक्षे तदुपगमादिभ्यः ॥ ४ ॥

The clause 'For the same reason' means because there is the text—'All sense-organs are combined with mind,' and because also they stop working before the mind ceases to function. Subsequent to the organ of speech, all the sense-organs are combined with the mind.

MANODHIKARAṆA 2

3. *Tanmanaḥ prāṇa uttarāt*

That mind combines with *Prāṇa* (*i.e.*, breath) owing to the subsequent statement.

There is a subsequent statement in the scripture ***namely***, 'Mind combines with breath' (***Chānd.*** VI-8-6). The mind together with all the sense-organs reaches the breath.

ADHYAKṢĀDHIKARAṆA 3

4. *Sodhyakṣe tadupagamādibhyaḥ*

That breath is united with the chief on account of going to it etc.

[1] सर्वं omitted M 3, Pr. [2] च added after Pr.

स प्राणोऽनन्तरं जीवेन संयुज्यते, "एवमेवेममात्मानमन्तकाले सर्वे प्राणा अभिसमायन्ति" इति प्राणस्य जीवोपगमादिश्रुतेः ॥

भूताधिकरणम् ४

भूतेषु तच्छ्रुतेः ॥ ५ ॥

"प्राणस्तेजसि" इति भूतान्तरसंसृष्टं तेजोऽभिधीयत इति प्राणो भूतेषु संयुज्यते[1] ॥

नैकस्मिन् दर्शयतो हि ॥ ६ ॥

"तेजसि" इति न तेजोमात्रे, त्रिवृत्करणश्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यां केवलस्य तेजसोऽनवस्थानात् ॥

That breath then reaches the individual self. This is stated in the scriptural text—'At the end all the breaths go to the self' (*Bṛh.* IV-3-38).

BHŪTĀDHIKARANA 4

5. *Bhūteṣu tacchrutech*

The Prāṇa joins with elements, this being stated.

In the scriptural text—'The *Prāṇa* joins with fire' (*Chānd.* VI-8-6) the word *fire* denotes the fire combined with other elements. Therefore the *Prāṇa* joins with elements.

6. *Naikasmin dars'ayato hi*

Not with one element; for both statements declare this.

'The *Prāna* combines with fire' (*Chānd.* VI-8-6). Here the word, 'fire' does not refer to the fire only; because

[1] प्राणा भूतेषु संयुज्यन्ते M 2, Pr.

आसृत्युपक्रमाधिकरणम् ५

समाना चासृत्युपक्रमादमृतत्वं चानुपोष्य ॥ ७ ॥

अर्चिरादिगत्युपक्रमात्प्रागुत्क्रान्तिर्विद्वदविदुषोः समाना, विदुषोऽर्चिरादिगत्या ब्रह्मप्राप्तिश्रुतेः ।

"यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि स्थिताः ।
अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते" ॥

इत्यत्रैवामृतत्वब्रह्मप्राप्तिवचनं शरीरेन्द्रियादिसंबन्धमदग्ध्वैवोपासनारम्भाभिप्रायमित्यभ्युपगन्तव्यमित्यर्थः ॥

fire cannot remain lonely, as there are scriptural and *Smṛti* texts to show that there is trinity of the elements.

ĀSṚTYUPAKRAMĀDHIKARAṆA 5

7. Samānā cāsṛtyupakramādamṛtatvaṁ cānupoṣya

It is common before the beginning of the way; and the immortality (is that which is obtained) without having burned.

Both the knower and the other follow the common route till the path begins with light, etc. because the scripture says that the knower reaches the *Brahman* by traversing the path of light etc. 'When all desires, which once dwelt in his heart are undone, then the mortal becomes immortal, then he obtains the *Brahman*' (*Kaṭh.* II-3-14). Here the statements, such as the immortality and the attainment of the *Brahman* refer to the starting of meditation without breaking the connection, that the self bears to the body and the sense organs.

तदापीतेः संसारव्यपदेशात् ॥ ८ ॥

अर्चिरादिगमनेन ब्रह्मप्राप्तेः प्राक् शरीरसंबन्धव्यपदेशात् तदमृतत्वादिवचनमुक्तप्रकारमेव ॥

सूक्ष्मं प्रमाणतश्च तथोपलब्धेः ॥ ९ ॥

शरीरादुत्क्रान्तस्यापि सूक्ष्मशरीरमनुवर्तते, अन्यथा गत्यनुपपत्तेः। न केवलं गत्यनुपपत्तिमात्रं सूक्ष्मशरीरवत्त्वे प्रमाणम्, चन्द्रमसा संवादादिप्रमाणान्तरतश्च सूक्ष्मशरीरवत्त्वोपलब्धेः "तं प्रति ब्रूयात्" "सत्यं ब्रूयात्" इति ॥

8. *Tadāpīteḥ saṁsāravyapadeśāt*

It is so; since upto the union with that *Brahman* is stated the continuance of *Saṁsāra.*

The self is connected with the body until he reaches the *Brahman* by traversing the path of light, etc. Therefore the statements on immortality etc. should be explained in the way mentioned above.

9. *Sūkṣmaṁ pramāṇataśca tathopalabdheḥ*

And the subtle body persists, on account of it being so observed in the scriptures.

A subtle body persists even after his departure from the gross body; otherwise he cannot traverse by the path. A subtle body is accepted not only by this reason but also because the other proofs, are observed in the scriptures such as the conversation with the moon etc. that establish the existence of a subtle body after departure. The scriptural text

नोपमर्देनातः ॥ १० ॥

अत उक्ताद्धेतोः "अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवति" इत्याद्यमृतत्वचनं न देहसंबन्धोपमर्देन ॥

अस्यैव चोपपत्तेरूष्मा ॥ ११ ॥

अस्य सूक्ष्मशरीरस्य विद्यमानत्वोपपत्तेश्च न तदुपमर्देन । उपलभ्यते ह्युत्क्रामतो विदुषः क्वचित्[1] सूक्ष्मदेहगुण ऊष्मा । अन्यत्रानुपलम्भान्न स स्थूलगुणः ॥

is this:—'He should reply to him, (*Kaus.* I-13). Speak as the truth' (*Kauṣ.* I-56).

10. *Nopamardenātaḥ*

Therefore not in the way of the destruction of bondage.

For the above reason, the statement of immortality, such as 'Then he becomes immortal' (*Kaṭh.* II-3-14) does not mean the destruction of the connection of the self with the body.

11. *Asyaiva copapatterūṣmā*

And to that very subtle body there belongs the warmth, this only being reasonable.

There is reason to hold that the subtle body persists even at the time of the departure of the self, as the warmth is apprehended in certain part as the quality of the subtle body,

[1] क्वचिदूष्मा सूक्ष्मदेहगुणः, न स्थूलदेहगुणः । अन्यत्रानुपलम्भात् । अतो विद्वान् सूक्ष्मशरीरेणोत्क्रमति । M 2.

प्रतिषेधादिति चेन्न शारीरात् स्पष्टो ह्येकेषाम् ॥ १२ ॥

"अथाकामयमानो न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति" इति विदुष उत्क्रान्तिप्रतिषेधादत्रैव साक्षाद् ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरिति चेत्; नैतत्। विदुष उत्क्रममाणस्यार्चिरादिकया गमनाय प्राणा न विश्लिष्यन्त इति ह्युच्यते "न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति" इति। अयमर्थो माध्यंदिनानां पाठे स्पष्टोऽभिधीयते "योऽकामो निष्काम आप्तकाम आत्मकामो न तस्मात्प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति" इति ॥

when he departs leaving the gross body. As the warmth is not apprehended in other parts of the body, it is not the quality of the gross body.

12. *Pratiṣedhāditi cenna sārīrāt spaṣṭo hyekeṣām*

If it be said that it is not so on account of the denial of his going up, we deny this for it is meant there the departure of the breath from the soul. This is clear according to some.

'He, who has no desire, his *Prāṇas* do not pass forth' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-6). That means the *Prānas* do not leave the wise. Hence the wise attain the *Brahman* here alone. This is not so. The wise, that leave the gross body, pass through the path of light, etc. and for that purpose the *Prānas* do not leave him. Hence it is stated thus 'His *Prānas* do not pass forth' (*Bṛh*, IV-4-6). This fact has been clearly stated in the version of the *Mādyandinas* thus: 'But of him, who has no desire, who is free from desire, whose desire is satisfied, whose desire is the self only, the *Prāṇas* do not pass forth.' (*Bṛh.* IV-4-6).

स्मर्यते च ॥ १३ ॥

विदुषोऽपि[1] मूर्धन्यनाड्या गमनं[2] स्मर्यते च—

"ऊर्ध्वमेकः स्थितस्तेषां यो भित्त्वा सूर्यमण्डलम् ।
ब्रह्मलोकमतिक्रम्य तेन याति परां गतिम्" ॥

इति ।

परसंपत्त्यधिकरणम् ६

तानि परे तथा ह्याह ॥ १४ ॥

"तेजः परस्यां देवतायाम्" इति श्रुतेः परदेवतासंपत्तिरुत्क्रममाणस्य विश्रमस्थानमिति तानि भूतानि जीवसंयुक्तानि परदेवतायां संपद्यन्ते ॥

13. *Smaryate ca*

Smṛtis also declare this.

The *Smṛti* texts also show that the wise depart by means of an artery of the head. 'Of those arteries one is situated above; by which the soul reaches the Highest goal piercing the disk of the sun and passing beyond the world of the *Brahman* (Hiraṇyagarbha)' (*Yājn. Smṛ.* III-167).

PARASAṀPATTYADHIKARAṆA 6

14. *Tāni pare tathā hyāha*

They unite with the Highest; for thus the scripture says.

The scripture says—'The fire unites with the Highest God' (*Chānd.* VI-8-6). That means those, that leave the

[1] अपि omitted M 3. [2] निष्क्रमणम् M 3.

अविभागाधिकरणम् ७

अविभागो वचनात् ॥ १५ ॥

परदेवतासंपत्तिवचनमविभागमात्रपरम्, "वाङ् मनसि संपद्यते" इति संपत्तिपदस्यैवात्रानुषक्तस्यार्थान्तरपरत्वे प्रमाणाभावात्। मनःप्रभृतिषु हि प्रलयासंभवादविभागमात्रम्[1] ॥

तदोकोऽधिकरणम् ८

तदोकोऽग्रज्वलनं तत्प्रकाशितद्वारो विद्यासामर्थ्यात्तच्छेषगत्यनुस्मृतियोगाच्च हार्दानुगृहीतः शताधिकया ॥ १६ ॥

body, have their place of rest in the Highest God with the elements associated with them.

AVIBHĀGĀDHIKARAṆA 7

15. *Avibhāgo vacanāt*

Non-division according to the statement.

The statement of their attaining the Highest Self, means that they are not divisible from the Highest Self, because there is no reason to hold a meaning different from that accepted in previous passage of the text—' The speech reaches the mind ' (*Chānd.* VI-8-6). The speach etc. do not merge in the mind and disappear completely. Hence it is stated that they are not divisible from the Highest.

TADOKODHIKARANA 8

16. *Tadokograjvalanaṁ tatprakāśitadvāro vidyāsāmarthyāt taccheṣagatyanusmṛtiyogācca hārdānugṛhītaḥ śatādhikayā*

The point of the abode of that Self, (*i.e.*, the heart)

[1] मात्रपरम् Pr.

हार्दपरमपुरुषाराधनरूपविद्यासामर्थ्यात् तदङ्गगतिचिन्तनेन च, प्रीतपरमपुरुषानुगृहीतस्तदनुग्रहतः प्रकाशिततद्द्वारो जीवः शताधिकया मूर्धन्यनाड्या गच्छति। तदनुग्रहादेव जीवस्थानमग्रे प्रकाशवद्भवति। हार्दः परमात्मा परमपुरूषः "तस्याः शिखाया मध्ये परमात्मा व्यवस्थितः" "सर्वस्य चाहं हृदि संनिविष्टः" इति हि श्रुतिस्मृती ॥

रश्म्यनुसाराधिकरणम् ९

रश्म्यनुसारी ॥ १७ ॥

becomes illuminated and the path of exit becomes clear by the grace of the Lord, who abides within the heart and who is pleased with the knowledge and the application of the remembrance of the way, which is an auxiliary element of that (knowledge). Then the soul passes out by the way of the hundred and first artery.

The self possesses the knowledge (meditation) that acts the worship of the Highest Self encased in the heart. He receives the blessings of the Highest Self through the power of the knowledge and thinking the way of the departure, an auxiliary element of the knowledge. Through the Lord's grace the door of the path becomes clear to him. Then he passes out by the way of the hundred and first artery. By His grace the point of the heart becomes illuminated. Here the Person said to have lived in the heart is the Highest Person. Thus say the scriptural and Smṛti texts—'The Highest Self is seated in the centre of the flame' (*Tait.* II-11-26). 'I am placed in the hearts of all' (*Bhag. Gī.* XV-15).

RAS'MYANUSĀRADHIKARAṆA 9

17. *Ras'myanus'ārī*

Following the rays (he goes).

"अथैतैरेव रश्मिभिरूर्ध्वमाक्रमते" इति श्रुतेर्विद्वान् रश्म्यनुसार्येव गच्छति। निश्यपि रश्मयः संभवन्त्येव, निदाघादावूष्मोपलब्धेः। हेमन्तेऽनुपलब्धिस्तु हिमाभिभवकृता॥

निशाधिकरणम् १०

निशि नेति चेन्न संबन्धस्य यावद्देहभावित्वाद् दर्शयति च॥ १८॥

"दिवा च शुक्लपक्षश्च" इत्यारभ्य "विपरीतं तु गर्हितम्" इति [1]निशामरणनिन्दनान्निशि मृतस्य विदुषो[2] न ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरिति चेत्; न, कर्म-

'He goes upwards following these rays only' (*Chānd.* VIII-6-5). Here it is said that the wise go through the rays only. The rays are at night also as their warmth is apprehended there in the summer etc. But the warmth is not apprehended in dewy season; because it has been overpowered by snow.

NIS'ĀDHIKARANA 10

18. *Nis'i neti cenna sambandhasya yāvaddeha-bhāvitvād dars'ayati ca*

Should it be said, not in the night, we say no; because the connection persists only as long as the body does. Scripture also declares this.

Death at night has been treated contemptuously in the text, beginning with, 'The day and the bright half of the month etc.' and ending with 'The contrary is condemned'. Therefore the wise who die at night do not reach the *Brahman.* It is not so. The works have the connection with

[1] निशि M 2. [2] विदुषः omitted Pr.

संबन्धस्य यावद्देहभावित्वात् प्रारब्धस्य यावच्चरमदेहावसानभावित्वाच्च ब्रह्मप्राप्तिविघ्नहेत्वभावात् । दर्शयति च "तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये" इति । निशानिन्देतरपुरुषविषया[1] ॥

दक्षिणायनाधिकरणम् ११

अतश्चायनेऽपि दक्षिणे ॥ १९ ॥

(अतः) बन्धहेत्वभावादेव,[2] दक्षिणायने मृतस्यापि विदुषो ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरस्त्येव ॥

him, only as long as he is connected with the body. Even those works, which have begun to produce the results, are with him, only as long as he is connected with the final body. Hence they do not stand in the way of the attainment of the *Brahman.* The scriptural text shows thus—'For him there is delay only as long as he is not freed from the body, then he will be united' (*Chānd.* VI-14-2). The contemptuous treatment about the death at night refers only to other persons (*i.e.* persons other than the wise).

DAKṢIṆĀYANADHIKARAṆA 11

19. *Atas'cayanepi dakṣiṇe*

For the same reason, also the death during the southern progress of the sun.

For the same reason *i.e.,* because there is nothing to keep the self any longer in the bondage of *Saṁsāra,* the wise reach the *Brahman* even if they die during the southern progress of the sun.

[1] पुरुषार्थविषया Pr. [2] हेतोः added after M 2.

योगिनः प्रति स्मर्येते स्मार्ते चैते ॥ २० ॥

"यत्र काले त्वनावृत्तिमावृत्तिं चैव योगिनः" इति न मरणकालः स्मर्यते; अपितु योगिनो विद्यानिष्ठान् प्रत्यर्चिरादिका तद्विपरीता चेति एते स्मार्ते स्मृतिविषयभूते गती स्मर्येते "नैते सृती पार्थ जानन् योगी मुह्यति कश्चन" इति वचनात् ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे चतुर्थस्याध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः ॥

---

20. *Yoginah prati smaryete smārte caite*

And these two paths are, with reference to the Yogins, mentioned in the *Smṛtis* as to be remembered.

'Oh! Arjuna, I shall tell you (now) the *Kāla*, by which after departing from this life, Yogins do not come back, or do come back' (*Bhag. Gī.* VIII-23). This passage does not mention the time of death. But it mentions the two paths one beginning with light etc. and the other in contrary, for the sake of thinking by the Yogins. The *Smṛti* text is this—'Oh! Arjuna, on knowing these two paths, no wise become deluded' (*Bhag. Gī.* VIII-27).

THUS ENDS THE 2ND PĀDA OF THE 4TH ADHYĀYA.

चतुर्थाध्याये तृतीयः पादः ॥

अर्चिराद्यधिकरणम् १

अर्चिरादिना तत्प्रथितेः ॥ १ ॥

अर्चिरादिनैकेन विद्वान् गच्छति, सर्वासु श्रुतिषु तच्चिह्नैस्तत्प्रत्यभिज्ञानात् ॥

वाय्वधिकरणम् २

वायुमब्दादविशेषविशेषाभ्याम् ॥ २ ॥

"मासेभ्यः संवत्सरं संवत्सरादादित्यम्" इत्यब्दादित्ययोर्मध्ये ब्रूयोः

ADHYĀYA IV, PĀDA III

ARCIRĀDYADHIKARAṆA 1

1. *Arcirādinā tatprathiteḥ*

On the path beginning with light, that being known.

The wise traverse on one and the same path of light etc.; because this path is referred to in all the texts with the same mark.

VĀYVADHIKARAṆA 2

2. *Vāyumabdādaviśeṣaviśeṣābhyām*

From the year to *Vāyu* (*i.e.*, the wind); on account of non-specification and specification.

'From the months into the year, from the year into the

प्रकरणान्तरयोरेकत्र देवलोकः श्रुतः ; इतरत्र [1]वायुः । [2]देवलोकशब्दो देवानां लोक इति वायोरविशेषेण वाचकः । वायुशब्दश्च तस्यैव विशेषेण वाचक इत्यविशेषविशेषाभ्यां देवलोकवायुशब्दाभ्यां वायुरेक एवाभिहित[3] इत्यब्दादूर्ध्वमादित्यात्पूर्वं वायुमेव निवेशयेत् ॥

वरुणाधिकरणम् ३

तटितोऽधिवरुणः संबन्धात् ॥ ३ ॥

तटितोऽनन्तरं वरुणो निवेश्यः, [4]मेघोदरवर्तित्वाद्विद्युतो मेघस्थजलात्मकत्वेन लोकवेदयोर्वरुणस्य विद्युत्संबन्धावगमात् ; तदनन्तरमिन्द्रप्रजापतिपाठक्रमात् प्रबलविशेषाभावाच्च ॥

sun' (*Chānd.* IV-15-5). In one text, the *Devaloka* (world of the gods) is mentioned between the year and the sun. In another text *Vāyu* (*i.e.*, the wind) is introduced between the year and the sun. The word *Devaloka* (the world of the gods) refers to *Vāyu* (*i.e.*, the wind) without any specification. The word *Vāyu* (*i.e.*, the wind) refers to the same with specification. Therefore *Vāyu* (*i.e.*, the wind) alone is referred to by the words, *Devaloka* (the world of gods) and '*Vāyu*'. Therefore *Vāyu* is to be placed after 'the year' and before 'the sun.'

VARUNĀDHIKARANA 3

3. *Taṭitodhi varuṇaḥ saṁbhandhāt*

Beyond lightning, there is *Varuṇa*; on account of connection.

After lightning comes *Varuṇa*. The lightning is within the clouds. *Varuṇa* is the presiding divinity of water contained

[1] वायुशब्दः Pr.
[2] तत्र देवलोकशब्दोऽपि A 1, Pr.
[3] विहितः A 1, Pr.
[4] मेघोदरवृत्तित्वात् M 1, 2 Pr.

आतिवाहिकाधिकरणम् ४

आतिवाहिकास्तल्लिङ्गात् ॥ ४ ॥

अर्चिराद्यभिमानिदेवताविशेषा विदुषामातिवाहिकत्वेन परमपुरुष-नियुक्ता इति विज्ञायते । "स एनान् ब्रह्म गमयति" इति तेष्वेकत्र गमयितृत्वदर्शनाल्लिङ्गात् ॥

वैद्युतेनैव ततस्तच्छ्रुतेः ॥ ५ ॥

"चन्द्रमसो विद्युतं तत्पुरुषोऽमानवः स एनान् ब्रह्म गमयति"

in the clouds. Hence it has been apprehended in the world and *S'ruti* that *Varuna* is connected with lightning. Then *Indra* and *Prajāpati* occur in the order as stated in the scripture. There are no other powerful special reasons for changing this order.

ĀTIVĀHIKĀDHIKARAṆA 4

4. *Ātivāhikāstalliṅgāt*

They are conductors, this being indicated.

It is understood that the presiding deities of light, etc., are directed by the Highest Person, as the conductors of the wise. There are indications to show that they direct the selves to the *Brahman* because one of them is seen to be the conductor as per the scriptural text. 'He takes them to the *Brahman*' (*Chānd.* IV-15-5).

5. *Vaidyutenaiva tatastacchruteḥ*

By lightning alone the wise conducted, because the text states that.

The scripture states thus—'From moon they proceed to lightning. That person is non-human. He takes them to the

इति श्रुतेर्वैद्युतपुरूषात् [1]परस्तात् स एव ब्रह्म गमयिता । वरूणेन्द्रप्रजापतीनां तदनुग्राहकत्वमेव ॥

कार्याधिकरणम् ५

कार्यं बादरिरस्य गत्युपपत्तेः ॥ ६ ॥

कार्यं हिरण्यगर्भमुपासीनानर्चिरादिर्नयति, अस्यैव गत्युपपत्तेः । न हि सर्वगतं परं ब्रह्मोपासीनानां गतिरस्तीति बादरिर्मेने ॥

विशेषितत्वाच्च ॥ ७ ॥

Brahman' (*Chānd.* IV-15-5). Therefore after reaching the person of lightning the wise are taken by him alone. *Varuṇa*, *Indra* and *Prajāpati* take part in the work so far only as they may assist the person of lightning in his task.

KĀRYĀDHIKARANA 5

6. *Kāryaṁ Bādarirasya gatyupapatteḥ*

They conduct him who meditates upon the effected *Brahman* (*i.e.*, *Hiraṇyagarbha*); thus *Bādari* thinks, because for him alone going is reasonable.

Him, who meditates upon the effected *Brahman* (*i.e.*, *Hiraṇyagarbha*) lead the light, etc.; because in his case only the journey is reasonable. The journey is not reasonable for those who meditate on the Highest *Brahman*, because He is everywhere.

7. *Viśeṣitatvācca*

And on account of that being specified.

[1] परतः M 1.

"पुरुषो मानस एत्य ब्रह्मलोकान् गमयति" "प्रजापतेः सभां वेश्म प्रपद्ये" इति च विशेषितत्वात् हिरण्यगर्भमेव ॥

सामीप्यात्तु तद्व्यपदेशः ॥ ८ ॥

"ब्रह्म गमयति" इति ब्रह्मव्यपदेशस्तत्सामीप्यात् । अस्य "यो ब्रह्माणं विदधाति पूर्वम्" इति सामीप्यमस्ति हि[1] ॥

कार्यात्यये तदध्यक्षेण सहातः परमभिधानात् ॥ ९ ॥

'The person born from His mind comes there and leads him to the *Brahman*-worlds' (*Bṛh.* VI. 2-15). 'I go to the residential hall of *Prajāpati*' (*Chānd.* VIII-14-1). On account of these specifications, they lead the wise who meditate upon *Hiranyagarbha* alone.

8. *Sāmīpyāttu tadvyapades'aḥ*

But on account of the nearness, there is such designation.

On account of nearness, there is the designation of the *Brahman* in the text 'He leads them to the *Brahman*' (*Chānd* IV-15-5). There is nearness as stated in the text. 'He who creates *Brahman* (*Hiranyagarbha*) first' (*S'v.* VI-18).

9. *Kāryātyaye tadadhyakṣeṇa sahātaḥ paramabhidhānāt*

On passing away of the effected world together with its ruler, they go to what is higher than that; on account of scriptural declaration.

[1] हि omitted A 1.

हिरण्यगर्भप्राप्तावप्यपुनरावृत्तिश्रुत्यविरोधः। हिरण्यगर्भलोकात्यये तद्-ध्यक्षेण सहातः परं गच्छति, "ते ब्रह्मलोके तु परान्तकाले परामृतात्परि-मुच्यन्ति सर्वे" इति श्रुतेः ॥

स्मृतेश्च ॥ १० ॥

"ब्रह्मणा सह ते सर्वे" इत्यारभ्य "प्रविशन्ति परं पदम्" इति स्मृतेश्च ॥

परं जैमिनिर्मुख्यत्वात् ॥ ११ ॥

परमुपासीनानर्चिरादिर्नयतीति[1] जैमिनिः, "ब्रह्म गमयति" इति [2]ब्रह्मशब्दस्य तत्रैव मुख्यत्वात् ॥

No contradiction arises in the text that establishes the non-return of the self, though he reaches *Hiranyagarbha*. When the world of *Hiranyagarbha* passes away, then the souls with its ruler go to what is higher than that. 'After living in the world of *Brahman* (*Hiranyagarbha*), at the time of deluge they reach the indestructible One and are released from the bondage' (*Tait.* II-10-22).

10. *Smṛteśca*

And on account of the *Smṛti* text.

Accordingly the *Smṛti* begins with, "All these along with *Brahman*" and ends with 'They enter the Highest Heaven'. (*Kūrm.* I-12-269).

11. *Paraṁ Jaiminirmukhyatvāt*

They lead those who meditate upon the Highest on account primariness; thus Jaimini thinks.

On account of the primariness of the meaning of the

[1] अर्चिरादिर्नयति omitted Pr. [2] ब्रह्मशब्दस्य omitted Pr.

दर्शनाच्च ॥ १२ ॥

"अस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य" इति श्रुतेश्च ॥

न च कार्ये प्रत्यभिसंधिः ॥ १३ ॥

"प्रजापतेः सभाम्" इति प्रत्यभिसंधिश्च न कार्ये, प्रजापतिशब्दस्य "पतिं विश्वस्य" इत्यादिश्रुतेः परस्मिन् ब्रह्मण्येव[1] मुख्यत्वात् । ब्रह्मलोक-शब्दश्च कर्मधारयवृत्त्या तत्रैवेत्यभिप्रायः । "ते ब्रह्मलोके" इति श्रुतिर्ब्रह्मैव

word *Brahman*, Jaimini thinks that the light etc., lead only those who meditate upon the Highest Self. The word *Brahman* in the text 'He leads to the *Brahman*' (*Chānd.* IV-15-6) is used in the primary sense.

12. *Darśanācca*

And it is seen declared in the scripture.

The scripture declares thus: 'Having risen from the body, and having reached the Highest Light' (*Chānd.* VIII-3-4).

13. *Na ca kārye pratyabhisaṁdhiḥ*

There is no aiming at the effected *Brahman*.

The aim meant in the text 'I go to the residential hall of the *Prajāpati*' is not the reaching the effected *Brahman*. The word, *Prajāpati*, according to the text 'The lord of the worlds' (*Tait.* II-11-3) refers to the Highest Self only in the primary sense. The word, *Brahmaloka* refers to the *Brahman*-world, by considering it as a compound of *Karmadārya* variety. The scriptural text 'They in the *Brahman*-world' refers to the Supreme *Brahman* only. The *Smṛti* text 'All

[1] ब्रह्मण्येव omitted Pr.

लोक इति परब्रह्मविषयैव। "ब्रह्मणा सह ते सर्वे" इति स्मृतिश्च "तदुपर्यपि" इति न्यायेन चतुर्मुखलोकस्थोपासनविषया[1] ॥

अप्रतीकालम्बनान्नयतीति बादरायण उभयथा च दोषात् तत्क्रतुश्च ॥ १४ ॥

प्रतीकालम्बना हि नामादिप्राणशब्दनिर्दिष्टप्रत्यगात्मस्वरूपपर्यन्तं सर्वं चिदचिद्वस्तुजातं ब्रह्मदृष्ट्या स्वरूपेण वा य उपासते, ते। अप्रतीकालम्बनास्तद्व्यतिरिक्ता ये पञ्चाग्निविदो ये च परं ब्रह्मोपासते; तान्नयत्यर्चिरादिरिति भगवान् बादरायणो मन्यते। कार्यमिति पक्षे परमेवेति

they along with the *Brahman*' (*Kūrm.* I-12-269) refers to those who are the residents of the world of effected *Brahman* and resort to the meditation on the Highest as taught in the *Brahmasūtra* I-3-25.

14. *Apratīkālambanān nayatīti Bādarāyaṇa ubhayathā ca doṣāt tatkratuśca*

They lead them whose objects of meditation are not symbols, thus *Bādarāyaṇa* thinks, because there is defect in both cases; and on conformity with the law of *Tatkratu*.

The clause 'The meditation on the symbols' means the meditation upon all the sentient and non-sentient beings mentioned with the series of terms beginning from name and ending with *Prāna* that means the self, viewing them as the *Brahman* or in their essential nature. The clause 'The meditation upon things other than the symbols' means the

[1] उपासीनविषया M 1.

च पक्षे सकलोपनिषद्विरोधरूपदोषः प्रसज्यते । कार्यपक्षे "ब्रह्म गमयति" "परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य" इत्याद्याः प्रकुप्येयुः । परमेवेति पक्षे "य एवमेतद्विदुर्ये चेमेऽरण्ये श्रद्धां सत्यमुपासते तेऽर्चिषमभिसंभवन्ति" इति श्रुतिः प्रकुप्येत् । कार्यपक्षे तत्क्रतुन्यायश्च विरुध्यते । अर्चिरादिना गतानां हि ब्रह्मप्राप्तिर-पुनरावृत्तिश्च श्रूयते । पञ्चाग्निविदस्तु, प्रकृतिवियुक्तात्मस्वरूपं "य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्" इत्यादिनावगतब्रह्मात्मभावमुपासत इति तेषामप्रतीकालम्बनत्वम् । तत्क्रतुन्यायाविरोधश्च । उभयेऽपि हि परिपूर्णं ब्रह्मोपासते मुखभेदेन— स्वा-त्मशरीरकं ब्रह्म केचन, ब्रह्मात्मकं स्वात्मानमितर इति ॥

meditation on other than those said above. *Bādarāyaṇa* thinks, that the light etc., lead them who know the five-fold fires and meditate upon the Highest Self following the latter class of the meditations said above. The contradiction with the statements made in all the Upanishadic passages arise, when the object of meditation is taken to be the effected *Brahman* or the Highest Self alone. If the object of meditation is taken to be the effected *Brahman* then the scriptural texts, 'They lead to the *Brahman*'. (*Chānd.* IV-15-6). and 'Having reached the Highest Light' (*Chānd.* VIII-3-4) will oppose this view. If the Highest Self alone is held to be the object of meditation, then the text, 'Those, who know this (*i.e.*, as stated in the *Pañcāgnividyā*) and those too who in the forest meditate with faith upon the Truth, go to light' (*Bṛh.* VI-2-15) will oppose the view. If the object of meditation is held to be the effected *Brahman* then the law of *Tatkratu* will also be contradicted. It is stated in the scriptures that those, who traverse through the path of light, etc., reach the *Brahman* and do not come back. The knowers of the five fires meditate on the self bereft of the *Prakṛti*, and having for his Self the *Brahman* as stated in the text, 'He, who remains in the self' (*Bṛh.* III-7-22

विशेषं च दर्शयति ॥ १५ ॥

कार्यमुपासीनानां ब्रह्मप्राप्तिव्यतिरिक्तपरिमितदेशकालफलविशेषं च दर्शयति श्रुतिः "यावन्नाम्नो गतम्" इत्यादिका ॥

इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे चतुर्थस्याध्यायस्य तृतीयः पादः ॥

Mdhy.). Hence they do not meditate on the symbols. There is no contradiction with law of *Tatkratu*. Both of them meditate upon the *Brahman* in different ways. Some meditate upon the *Brahman* who has themselves for His body. Others meditate upon themselves having the *Brahman* for their Soul.

15. *Viśeṣaṁ ca darśayati*

And scripture declares the difference.

The meditation on the effected *Brahman* grants fruits in limited places and limited times, that are different from the attainment of the *Brahman* This is stated in the text, 'He, who meditates upon name as *Brahman*, for him there is movement as he wishes as far as name extends' (*Chānd.* VII-1-5).

THUS ENDS THE 3RD PĀDA OF THE 4TH ADHYĀYA.

चतुर्थाध्याये चतुर्थः पादः ॥

संपद्याविर्भावाधिकरणम् १

संपद्याविर्भावः स्वेनशब्दात् ॥ १ ॥

" एवमेवैष संप्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात्समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते " इति सिद्धस्यैव प्रत्यगात्मस्वरूपस्यानादिकर्मणा तिरोहितस्य परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्याविर्भाव उच्यते, " स्वेन रूपेण " इति विशिष्याभिधानात् ॥

ADHYĀYA IV, PĀDA IV

SAṀPADYĀVIRBHĀVĀDHIKARAṆA 1

1. *Saṁpadyāvirbhāvaḥ svenaśabdāt*

On the self, on reaching the Highest Self, there is manifestation; as we infer from the word, 'own'.

'Thus that serene self, having risen from the body and having reached the Highest Light, becomes manifest in his own form' (*Chānd.* VIII-12-2). This scriptural text states that the self has been already in possession of his essential nature and it has been concealed by the beginningless *Karman*. When he reaches the Highest Light, it manifests itself; because thus has been stated in the scriptural text by the specific words, 'With his own form'.

मुक्तः प्रतिज्ञानात् ॥ २ ॥

आत्मस्वरूपमात्रस्य प्रागेव सिद्धत्वेऽपि कर्मबन्धविनिर्मुक्तापरिच्छिन्नज्ञानादिस्वरूपस्य ह्यत्राविर्भाव उच्यते । "एतं त्वेव ते भूयोऽनुव्याख्यास्यामि" इति जागरिताद्यवस्थातिरोधानविनिर्मुक्तस्यैवात्र वक्तव्यतया प्रतिज्ञानात् ॥

आत्मा प्रकरणात् ॥ ३ ॥

"भूयोऽनुव्याख्यास्यामि" इति [1]प्रकृतोऽपहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणक आत्मेति प्रकरणादवगम्यते । "य आत्मापहतपाप्मा" इत्यारभ्य "सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पः सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः" इति प्रकृत्य "एतं त्वेव ते भूयोऽनुव्याख्यास्यामि" इत्युक्तम् ॥

2. *Muktaḥ pratijñānāt*

The released one, on account of the promise.

The essential nature of the self has been already in him. But this nature including 'unlimited knowledge' etc., manifests itself only in *Mukti* because he is freed from bondage of *Karman* at that stage. The promise made in the text. 'I will explain further to you' (*Chānd.* VIII-9-3) is to explain that, whose concealment in the waking state etc has been removed.

3. *Ātmā prakaraṇāt*

The self; on account of the subject matter.

It is understood from the context that the scriptural text 'I will explain this further to you' (*Chānd.* VIII-9-3) refers to the self as endowed with good qualities such as freedom from evil. The text mentioned above begins to describe thus

[1] प्रकृतापहत M 1 Pr.

अविभागेनदृष्टत्वाधिकरणम् २

अविभागेन दृष्टत्वात् ॥ ४ ॥

आविर्भूतस्वरूपोऽयं मुक्तात्मा स्वात्मशरीरकं परं ब्रह्म स्वात्मनोऽप्यात्मतया 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' इत्यविभागेनैवानुभवति, "आत्मेति तूपगच्छन्ति ग्राहयन्ति च" इति [1]तथाविधस्वरूपोपासनेन तथाविधस्वरूपस्य दृष्टत्वात्। "य आत्मनि तिष्ठन् यस्यात्मा शरीरं स त आत्मा" "तत्त्वमसि" इत्यादिशास्त्रसिद्धमेव ह्युपासितम् ॥

'The self is free from evil' and goes on to say, 'His desires are true. His Will is true. He should be searched for' (*Chānd.* VIII-7-1).

AVIBHĀGENADṚṢṬATVĀDIKARANA 2

4. *Avibhāgena dṛṣṭatvāt*

(The released self is conscious of himself) as being non-separate (from the Highest self); because this is seen.

The essential nature of this released self has manifested itself. Then he experiences the Highest *Brahman*, who is his Self, as non-separate from himself in the manner 'I am the *Brahman*.' By meditating upon Him in the way mentioned in the *Brahma-Sūtrās* IV-1-3 His essential nature is to be experienced only in that form. The object of meditation is only what is established by the scriptures—'He who dwells within the self, of whom the self is the body' 'That thou art' (*Chānd.* VI-8-7) etc.

[1] तथारूपोपासनेन M 2, Pr,

ब्राह्माधिकरणम् ३

ब्राह्मेण जैमिनिरुपन्यासादिभ्यः ॥ ५ ॥

अस्य स्वरूपाविर्भावो ब्राह्मेणापहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणकस्वरूपेण[1] । ते हि ब्रह्मगुणाः प्रत्यगात्मनोऽपि स्वाभाविका गुणा इति "य आत्मापहतपाप्मा" इत्यारभ्योपन्यासादिभ्योऽवगम्यते । त एव "जक्षत्क्रीडन् रममाणः" इत्यादिनोच्यन्ते इति जैमिनेर्मतम् ॥

चितितन्मात्रेण तदात्मकत्वादित्यौडुलोमिः ॥ ६ ॥

"विज्ञानघन एव" इत्यवधारणात् विज्ञानमात्रस्वरूप इत्यौडुलोमिः ॥

BRĀHMĀDHIKARANA 3

5. *Brāhmeṇa jaiminirupanyāsādibhyaḥ*

Jaimini thinks that a nature like that of the *Brahman*, manifests itself on the self; on account of the declaration etc.

A nature like that of the *Brahman*, consisting of the qualities such as 'Freedom from evils' manifests itself in the individual self. These are the qualities of the *Brahman*; Yet they belong to the individual self also. This has been understood from the declaration found in the text, 'The self is free from evils etc.' (*Chānd.* VIII-7-1). Same thing has been stated in the text, 'He is eating, playing, rejoicing' (*Chānd.* VIII-12-3). This is the view of *Jaimini*.

6. *Cititanmātreṇa tadātmakatvādityouḍulomiḥ*

The intelligence alone manifests, as the self is of that nature. Thus *Audulomi* thinks.

It is apprehended in the scriptures that he is only a mass

[1] गुणक omitted M 3.

एवमप्युपन्यासात्पूर्वभावादविरोधं बादरायणः ॥ ७ ॥

"विज्ञानघन एव" इति स्वप्रकाशस्वरूप इत्यवगतेऽपि "य आत्मापहतपाप्मा" इत्युपन्यासादिना पूर्वेषामपहतपाप्मत्वादीनामपि सद्भावावगमादुभयश्रुत्यवगतोभयस्वरूपस्य परस्परविरोधाभावाद्रूपद्वयं नान्योन्यपरिहारीत्युभयरूपसमुच्चयं भगवान् बादरायणो मेने ॥

संकल्पाधिकरणम् ४

संकल्पादेव तच्छ्रुतेः ॥ ८ ॥

of knowledge. Therefore *Audulomi* thinks that he is of the nature of intelligence alone.

7. *Evamapyupanyāsāt pūrvabhāvādavirodhaṁ Bādarāyaṇaḥ*

Even it is thus, on account of the declaration of the existence of former qualities, *Bādarāyaṇa* holds absence of contradiction.

It has been understood that the mass of knowledge is the nature of the individual self. Yet the former qualities, such as 'Freedom from evils' etc. are apprehended in him. This is stated in the text, 'The self is free from evils.' (*Chānd.* VIII-7-1). The two groups of natures apprehended in the two texts are not contradictory each other. Therefore of these two forms one does not exclude the other. Therefore the illustrious *Bādarāyaṇa* thinks there is a collection of both the natures in the self.

SAṀKALPĀDHIKARAṆA 4

8. *Saṁkalpādeva tacchruteḥ*

By the mere will; the scriptures declare that.

"स यदि पितृलोककामः" इत्यादिनावगताः पित्रादयः[1] "संकल्पादेवास्य" इति श्रुतेः संकल्पादेव भवन्ति। यथा परमपुरुषस्य लीलाप्रवृत्तस्य दशरथवसुदेवादयः स्वसंकल्पादेव भवन्ति, एवमेव परमपुरुषलीलान्तर्गतस्य मुक्तस्यापि तदुपकरणभूताः पित्रादयः स्वसंकल्पादेव भवन्तीत्यर्थः ॥

अत एव चानन्याधिपतिः ॥ ९ ॥

अत एव "अपहतपाप्मा सत्यसंकल्पः" इत्यादिश्रुतेर्न कदापि [2]कर्माधीनोऽयम् ॥

The ancestors etc., that are mentioned in the scriptural text 'should he desires to be with his ancestors' (*Chānd.* VIII-2-1) are present at his mere will according to the text 'By his mere will' (*Chānd.* VIII-2-1). The Highest Person, while in a sportive mood is born as the son of *Das'aratha* etc. *Vasudeva*, by His mere will; In the same manner the released self, that is included in the sportive action of the Highest Person can have his ancestors in this world through his own will.

9. *Ata eva cānanyādhipatiḥ*

For the same reason he has no other ruler.

The clause 'For the same reason' means by the scriptural authorities *viz.*, 'Freedom from sin, true will etc.' (*Chānd.* VIII-7-1). The released self is not subject to *Karman* at any time.

[1] ज्ञात्यादयः A 1, M 1, 2

[2] मुक्तानामपीश्वराधीनत्वात् कथ तेषामनन्याधिपतित्वमित्याशङ्कायां न कर्माधीनोऽयमित्युक्तमिति गम्यते। एवच अनन्याधिपतिरित्यस्य ईश्वरादन्यः कर्मादिः अधिपतिः प्रेरको न यस्येत्यर्थः। न तु स्वस्मादन्य ईश्वरादिः प्रेरको नास्तीति।

अभावाधिकरणम् ५

अभावं बादरिराह ह्येवम् ॥ १० ॥

तस्य देहेन्द्रियाद्युपकरणाभावं बादरिर्मेने । "न ह वै सशरीरस्य" इत्यादिर्हि तदभावमाह ॥

भावं जैमिनिर्विकल्पामननात् ॥ ११ ॥

"स एकधा भवति" इत्यादिना देहेन्द्रियादिभिर्विविधताश्रुतेर्देहाद्युपकरणसद्भावं जैमिनिर्मेने ॥

ABHĀVĀDHIKARAṆA 5

10. *Abhāvaṁ Bādarirāha hyevam*

The absence of body, etc. *Bādari* opined; for thus scripture says.

Bādari opined that the Released souls do not have the instruments, such as body and sense-organs It is because the text 'Verily there is no freedom from pleasure and pain for him while he is incorporate' (*Chānd.* VIII-12-1) declares thus.

11. *Bhāvaṁ Jaiminirvikalpāmananāt*

The presence of body etc. *Jaimini* opines, because the text declares manifoldness.

There are texts, such as, 'He is one-fold' (*Chānd.* VII-26-2) that prove that he becomes manifold with the help of

अन्यशब्दार्थान्तर्गतभेदप्रतियोगी चेश्वरः, न तु मुक्तजीव इति भावः । अस्त्वेवं प्रकृते । 'स स्वराड् भवति' इति श्रुतेस्तर्हि कोऽर्थः? स्वराड् इत्यत्र हि स्वयमेव राजेति भाषितं भाष्यकारैः । तथाच स्वस्मान्मुक्तात्मनोऽन्यस्येश्वरस्यापि नियन्तृत्वं निषिध्यत इति चेत्; न, सत्यसंकल्पत्वतात्पर्यकत्वात्तस्य । मुक्तात्मनो हि संकल्पः सर्वोऽपि न कदाचिदपि न केनापि व्याहन्यते । ईश्वरोऽप्यस्य संकल्पं न व्याहन्ति; यत ईश्वरानभिमतं संकल्पमयं कदापि न करोति ।

द्वादशाहवदुभयविधं बादरायणोऽतः ॥ १२ ॥

उभयश्रुतेः सशरीरत्वमशरीरत्वं चेच्छातः; यथा द्वादशाह उभयश्रुतेः सत्रमहीनं च भवति ॥

तन्वभावे संध्यवदुपपत्तेः ॥ १३ ॥

स्वेनैव सृष्टतन्वाद्यभावे स्वप्ने "अथ रथान् रथयोगान् पथः सृजते ।" इति परमपुरुषसृष्टैः [1]भोगवत् मुक्तोऽपि परमपुरुषसृष्टैरेव लीलारसं भुङ्क्ते ॥

the body and the sense-organs. *Jaimini* opines that the instruments, such as, body etc, are present in the Released soul.

12. *Dvādaśāhavadubhayavidhaṁ Bādarāyaṇotaḥ*

For the same reason, *Bādarāyaṇa* holds that he is of both kinds; as in the case of the twelve-days' sacrifice.

There are texts to show that, as and when he desires, he can have body or not. The analogous case is the twelve-days' sacrifice, which according to the texts, belongs either to the *Sattra* or the *Ahīna* class of sacrifices.

13. *Tanvabhāve saṁdhyavadupapatteḥ*

In the absence of the body, the Released soul experiences pleasure etc. as in the state of dream; that being possible.

The Released soul does not possess body that is his own creation. In that case he enjoys the sport, with the instruments created by the Highest Person. This is analogous

[1] इष्टभोगवत् A 1, M 3.

भावे जाग्रद्वत् ॥ १४ ॥

स्वेनैव सृष्टोपकरणभावे जाग्रत्पुरुषवत् भुङ्क्ते ॥

प्रदीपवदावेशस्तथाहि दर्शयति ॥ १५ ॥

एकदेशस्थितस्यापि स्वप्रभारूपज्ञानव्याप्त्या सर्वानुभवः सिध्यति । "वालाग्रशतभागस्य" इत्यारभ्य "स चानन्त्याय कल्पते" इति हि दर्शयति ॥

to the creation effected in dreams by the Highest Person. This is stated in the text, 'Then He creates chariots, horses, roads' (*Bṛh.* IV-3-10).

14. *Bhāve jāgradvat*

When there is the body, he experiences as in the state of waking.

Suppose he creates the instruments, such as body etc. Then he enjoys the pleasures with them as one does in his waking state.

15. *Pradīpavadāveśastathāhi darśayati*

His entering is as in the case of a lamp; for thus the scripture declares.

The self remains in one place. But it is proved that he experiences everything through the pervasion of his knowledge, that acts as his brilliance. The scriptures state thus: 'That self is to be known as a portion of the hundredth part of a point of a hair divided into hundred parts, and yet he is capable of infinity' (*S've.* V-9).

स्वाप्ययसंपत्त्योरन्यतरापेक्षमाविष्कृतं हि ॥ १६ ॥

"प्राज्ञेनात्मना संपरिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किंचन वेद नान्तरम्" इति वेदनाभाववचनं सुषुप्तिमरणयोरन्यतरापेक्षमित्युक्तम् । "नाह खल्वयमेवं संप्रत्यात्मानं जानात्ययमहमस्मि" इत्यादिना सुषुप्त्यादावकिंचिज्ज्ञत्वमाविष्कृतं हि ॥

जगद्व्यापारवर्जाधिकरणम् ६

जगद्व्यापारवर्जं प्रकरणादसंनिहितत्वाच्च ॥ १७ ॥

अपहतपाप्मत्वादिसत्यसंकल्पत्वपर्यन्तं मुक्तस्य जगज्जन्मादिकारणत्व-

16. *Svāpyayasaṁpattyoranyatarāpekṣamāviṣkṛtaṁ hi*

It refers either to the sound sleep or to union (*Saṁpatti*); for this is declared.

'The self being embraced by the Intelligent Self does not experience either the exterior or the interior.' (*Bṛh.* IV-3-21). It is stated that this statement of non-experience refers to either to the state of sound sleep or death. 'Alas! in fact now, he does not know himself, that 'I am he' (*Chānd.* VIII-11-1). Thus it is seen that in the state of sound sleep, etc. he knows nothing.

JAGADVYĀPĀRAVARJĀDHIKARAṆA 6

17. *Jagdvyāpāravarjaṁ prakaraṇādasaṁnihitatvācca*

With the exception of the activity for the sake of the world, he possesses the other qualities; on account of the context and of non-proximity.

The Released self possesses all the qualities mentioned in the texts beginning from 'freedom from sin' and ending with

वर्जम् । "यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते" इत्यारभ्य "तद्ब्रह्म" इत्यादिना जगत्सृष्ट्यादि परस्यैवेति प्रकरणादवगम्यते । सृष्ट्यादिप्रकरणेषु मुक्तस्यासंनिहितत्वाच्च । मुक्तस्यातिरोहितस्वमाहात्म्यस्यानवधिकातिशयानन्दपरिपूर्णब्रह्मानुभव एव । ब्रह्मणोऽपि जगद्व्यापारो लीलामात्रमिति "लोकवत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम्" इत्युक्तम् ॥

प्रत्यक्षोपदेशादिति[1] चेन्नाधिकारिकमण्डलस्थोक्तेः ॥ १८ ॥

'True will'. He does not possess the character of being the cause in the creation etc., of the world. From the context, it is apprehended that the Highest *Brahman* alone possesses the power of the creation etc., of the world. The text begins with 'From Him are born all these beings' and concludes 'That is the *Brahman*' (*Tait.* I-2-1). Moreover in texts dealing with creation, etc., the Released self does not find a place. The Released self possesses greatness, that has not been concealed by anything. He experiences the *Brahman* in His complete nature, possessed of unsurpassed bliss. The creation etc., conducted by the *Brahman* are only the sport for Him. This has been stated in the *Brahma-sūtra* II-1-33.

18. *Pratyakṣopadeśāditi cennādhikārika-maṇḍalasthokteḥ*

If it be said that this is not so; on account of the scriptual text; not so, because it refers to the state of him who resides within the spheres of those entrusted with special duties.

[1] इति omitted M 2, M 3.

"इमाँल्लोकान् कामान्नी कामरूप्यनुसंचरन्" इत्युपदेशाज्जगद्व्यापारोऽस्तीति चेत्; न, हिरण्यगर्भाद्याधिकारिकमण्डलस्थभोगोक्तेः। न हि तत्र नियमनं श्रुतम् ॥

विकारावर्ति च, तथाहि स्थितिमाह ॥ १९ ॥

विकारासंसृष्टपरिपूर्णपरब्रह्मानुभव एव तस्य सुखम्। [1]तथास्य स्थिति "रसो वै सः। रसँ ह्येवायं लब्ध्वानन्दी भवति" इत्याह ॥

दर्शयतश्चैवं प्रत्यक्षानुमाने ॥ २० ॥

This is the teaching of the text: 'He moves through these worlds, eating what he desires, and assuming any shape what he desires' (*Tait.* I-10-5). Hence the Released self creates the worlds. It is not so; because they are the pleasures of those who are in the region of *Hiranyagarbha* etc., who are entrusted with special duties. Indeed the text does not say that he controls those worlds.

19. *Vikārāvarti ca tathāhi sthitimāha*

The Released self experiences the Unchangeable one; the scriptures state his condition thus.

His pleasure consists of only the enjoyment of the *Brahman* in His real and entire nature, that does not undergo any changes. His condition has been stated in the text thus: 'Bliss indeed is He; having obtained that Bliss, he becomes blissful' (*Tait.* I-7-1).

20. *Dars'ayatas'caivaṁ pratykṣānumāne*

And thus perception and inference show.

[1] तथाहि A.1.

उक्तमर्थं श्रुतिस्मृती च दर्शयतः। "तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः" "एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने" इत्यादिका श्रुतिः। स्मृतिरपि—"अहं सर्वस्य प्रभवो मत्तः सर्वं प्रवर्तते" इति ॥

भोगमात्रसाम्यलिङ्गाच्च ॥ २१ ॥

"सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह। ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता" इति ब्रह्मानुभवरूपभोगमात्रसाम्यलिङ्गाच्च ॥

अनावृत्तिः शब्दादनावृत्तिः शब्दात् ॥ २२ ॥

"स खल्वेवं वर्तयन् यावदायुषं ब्रह्मलोकमभिसंपद्यते न च पुनरा-

This fact has been stated in the texts of *S'ruti* and *Smṛti* 'From this Self mentioned above, verily, the spatial ether came into existence' (*Tait.* I-2-2). 'Oh! *Gārgī*! verily, under the ruling of this Imperishable One' (*Bṛh.* III-8 9). There is also the *Smṛti.* 'I am the source of all; everything proceeds from Me' (*Bhag. Gī.* X-8).

21. *Bhogamātrasāmyaliṅgācca*

And on account of the indication, namely, 'equality in enjoyment only'.

'He enjoys all desires and the omniscient *Brahman*' (*Tait.* I-2-2). This scriptural text says that the Released self is equal to the Highest Self, only in so far as enjoyment of the true nature of the *Brahman.*

22. *Anāvṛttiḥ s'abdāt anāvṛtiḥ s'abdāt*

No returning; according to the scriptures. No returning;-according to the scriptures.

Consider the scriptural text 'He, who lives thus all the

वर्तते" इति शब्दान्निवृत्तसमस्ततिरोधान आविर्भूतापहतपाप्मत्वादिगुणगणोऽनवधिकातिशयानन्दं परं ब्रह्मानुभवति; न च पुनरावर्तत इति निश्चीयत इति सर्वं समञ्जसम् ॥

[1]इति श्रीभगवद्रामानुजविरचिते वेदान्तसारे चतुर्थस्याध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः ॥

अध्यायश्च समाप्तः ।

शास्त्रं च समाप्तम् ।

---

life through, reaches the world of the *Brahman* and he does not return' (*Chānd.* VIII-15-1). The Released self becomes free from all, that has concealed his true nature. The host of qualities such as, 'Freedom from sin' manifests themselves in him. He experiences the Highest *Brahman*, who is unsurpassable Bliss. He does not return again to this world. This has been so determined. Thus the entire truth of the doctrine is perfect and faultless.

THUS ENDS THE 4TH PĀDA OF THE 4TH ADHYĀYA.

---

[1] M 3 reads the following verse after the colophon:

"अविस्तृताः सुगम्भीरा रामानुजमुनेर्गिरः ।
दर्शयन्तु प्रसादेन स्व भावमखिल इदम् ॥"

M 1 reads the following verse after the colophon.

"स्वाधीनयति यो नित्य बलात्कृत्य मनो मम ।
तस्मै रामानुजार्याय नमः स्ताद्ब्रह्मयोगिने ॥"

APPENDEX I

सूत्रानुक्रमणिका

53

APPENDIX II

उदाहृतप्रमाणवाक्यानामनुक्रमः

अ

आ

इ

ई

उ

ऊ

ऋ

ए

ऐ

ओ

औ

क

ख

ग

च

छ

ज

त

द

ध

न

ब

भ

म

य

श

स

ह

APPENDIX III

अधिकरणानुक्रमणी

APPENDIX IV

अ० पु०	अग्निपुराणम्	तै० आर०	तैत्तिरीयारण्यकम्
आ० ध०	आपस्तम्बधर्मसूत्रम्	तै० उ०	तैत्तिरीयोपनिषत्
आ० श्रौ०	आपस्तम्बश्रौतसूत्रम्	पा० सू०	पाणिनिसूत्रम्
ई० उ०	ईशोपनिषत्	प्रश्न० उ०	प्रश्नोपनिषत्
ऋ० सं०	ऋक्संहिता	बृ० उ०	बृहदारण्यकोपनिषत्
ऐ० आ०	ऐतरेयारण्यकम्	ब्र० सू०	ब्रह्मसूत्रम्
ऐ० उ०	ऐतरेयोपनिषत्	भ० गी०	भगवद्गीता
कठ० उ०	कठोपनिषत्	मनु०	मनुस्मृतिः
कूर्म० पु०	कूर्मपुराणम्	मु० उ०	मुण्डकोपनिषत्
कौ० उ०	कौषीतक्युपनिषत्	या० स्मृ०	याज्ञवल्क्यस्मृतिः
गौ० ध०	गौतमधर्मसूत्रम्	वि० पु०	विष्णुपुराणम्
छान्दो० उ०	छान्दोग्योपनिषत्	श० ब्रा०	शतपथब्राह्मणम्
जै० सू०	जैमिनिसूत्रम्	शान्ति०	शान्तिपर्व
ता० ब्रा०	ताण्ड्यब्राह्मणम्	श्वे० उ०	श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषत्
तै० ब्रा०	तैत्तिरीयब्राह्मणम्	सु० उ०	सुबालोपनिषत्
तै० सं०	तैत्तिरीयसंहिता		

ERRATA

Page	Line	Read
१४	७	महिमानमिति
२२४	२४	यास्कोऽप्याह
२५७	४	श्लोकाः
३५३	३	अपि
३६७	७	उपासीत
४२६, २७, २९, ३१	heading	प्रमाणवाक्यानाम्